# NOTE

This Microfiche meets the quality requirements of the American National Standard for Microfiche of Documents (ANSI PH5.9-1975). However, because of imperfections in the document from which it was made, it contains images that are illegible or difficult to read. The source document for this microfiche is the best copy that could be obtained prior to filming.

Congressional Information Service, Inc.
Washington, D.C.

**Calendar No. 961**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 101st Congress<br>*2d Session* | SENATE | Report<br>101-521 |

# DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1991

---

October 11 (legislative day, October 2), 1990.—Ordered to be printed

---

Mr. Inouye, from the Committee on Appropriations,
submitted the following

# REPORT

[To accompany S. 3189]

The Committee on Appropriations reports the bill (S. 3189) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991, and for other purposes, and submits the following explanation of its recommendations. Information is herewith presented relative to changes made:

| | |
|---|---|
| Total of bill as reported to Senate: New obligational authority | $268,240,850,000 |
| Total of 1991 budget estimate | 287,282,674,000 |
| Amount of fiscal year 1990 enacted | 284,428,976,000 |
| The bill as reported to the Senate: | |
| Below fiscal year 1991 budget estimate | 19,041,824,000 |
| Under enacted appropriations for fiscal year 1990 | 16,188,126,000 |

34-953

# CONTENTS

Background: Page
- Purpose of the bill .......... 4
- National foreign intelligence budget and related budgets .......... 4
- Hearings .......... 5
- Summary of bill .......... 5
- Budget summit agreement and 302(b) allocation .......... 5

Budget impact of the bill .......... 6

## TITLE I—MILITARY PERSONNEL

Military personnel .......... 7
Military personnel, Army .......... 10
Military personnel, Navy .......... 11
Military personnel, Marine Corps .......... 11
Military personnel, Air Force .......... 12
Military personnel, Army Reserve .......... 14
Military personnel, Navy Reserve .......... 14
Military personnel, Marine Corps Reserve .......... 14
Reserve personnel, Air Force .......... 15
Reserve personnel, Army National Guard .......... 15
Reserve personnel, Air National Guard .......... 15

## TITLE II—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Operation and maintenance .......... 17
Servicewide operation and maintenance issues and programs—Force structure and support .......... 17
Overseas workload program .......... 27
Corporate information management .......... 29
Operation and maintenance, Army .......... 49
Operation and maintenance, Navy .......... 52
Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps .......... 56
Operation and maintenance, Air Force .......... 56
Operation and maintenance, Defense Agencies .......... 62
Operation and maintenance, Army Reserve .......... 66
Operation and maintenance, Navy Reserve .......... 66
Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve .......... 67
Operation and maintenance, Air Force Reserve .......... 67
Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard .......... 68
Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard .......... 68
National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice .......... 68
Court of Military Appeals .......... 69
Environmental restoration, Defense .......... 69
Humanitarian relief .......... 70

## TITLE III—PROCUREMENT

Estimates and appropriation summary .......... 71
Aircraft procurement, Army .......... 73
Missile procurement, Army .......... 77
Procurement of weapons and tracked combat vehicles, Army .......... 80
Procurement of ammunition, Army .......... 87
Other procurement, Army .......... 92
Aircraft procurement, Navy .......... 100
Weapons procurement, Navy .......... 105
Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy .......... 110

Page
Other procurement, Navy ........ 114
Procurement, Marine Corps ........ 124
Aircraft procurement, Air Force ........ 128
Missile procurement, Air Force ........ 133
Other procurement, Air Force ........ 142
Procurement, Defense Agencies ........ 151
National Guard and Reserve equipment ........ 158
Defense Production Act purchases ........ 163

TITLE IV—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

Summary of Committee action ........ 164
Research, development, test and evaluation, Army ........ 171
Research, development, test and evaluation, Navy ........ 188
Research, development, test and evaluation, Air Force ........ 205
Research, development, test and evaluation, Defense Agencies ........ 224
Developmental test and evaluation, Defense ........ 241
Operational test and evaluation, Defense ........ 243

TITLE V—REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

Revolving and management funds ........ 245
Army stock fund ........ 246
Navy stock fund ........ 246
Air Force stock fund ........ 246
Defense stock fund ........ 246
Army industrial fund ........ 247
Navy industrial fund ........ 247
Defense industrial fund ........ 247

TITLE VI—OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

Chemical agents and munitions destruction, Defense ........ 248
Drug interdiction and counterdrug activities, Defense ........ 251
Inspector general ........ 256

TITLE VII—RELATED AGENCIES

Payment to the CIA retirement and disability system fund ........ 257
Intelligence Community Staff ........ 257
Compliance with paragraph 7, rule 16 ........ 258
Compliance with paragraph 12, rule 26 ........ 258

TITLE VIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

General provisions ........ 259

# BACKGROUND

## Purpose of the Bill

The purpose of this bill is to make appropriations for the military functions of the Department of Defense for the period October 1, 1990, through September 30, 1991. Functional areas include the pay, allowances and support of military personnel, operation and maintenance of the forces, procurement of equipment and systems, and research, development, test and evaluation. Appropriations for military assistance, military construction, family housing, nuclear warheads, and civil defense are provided in other bills.

In its examination of the President's budget for defense appropriations the Committee has made a deliberate effort to review funding requests within the context of the national security objectives they are intended to serve. The Committee believes that presenting requests for defense appropriations or considering individual weapons systems or force structures without reference to the ends they are intended to serve is to rob them of any intelligible meaning. We have, therefore, sought the views of policymakers in the Department of State, as well as the Department of Defense. That defense policy should be considered in such a way was the intent of the National Security Act of 1947, which created what was then known as the National Military Establishment and what came to be known as the Department of Defense.

In addition, the Committee has sought the views of the United States' principal field commanders, the Commanders in Chief, or CINC's, as they are more popularly known. We have listened carefully to the views of the CINC's in order to be assured that our recommendations are responsive to the requirements of those who command forces on the front lines of freedom.

### NATIONAL FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE BUDGET AND RELATED BUDGETS

The Committee has reviewed the National Foreign Intelligence Program budget, the intelligence-related activities budgets, and special access program budgets which are funded in this bill. The results of the Committee's review are made available in a separate classified annex as an integral part of this bill, and further explained in a classified report accompanying the bill. The intelligence community and the Department of Defense are expected to comply fully with the provisions of the classified annex, and the recommendations and directives in its accompanying report.

The Committee is aware of past instances in which components and program offices of the Department of Defense responsible for conducting specific special access programs have not received timely and complete notification of the recommendations and directives contained in the classified annexes for annual appropriations measures. This situation has resulted in actions contrary to Committee guidance.

It is the responsibility of the Directorate for Special Programs and the Comptroller within the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and of the appropriate budget and comptroller organizations for each of the armed services, to ensure proper notification of Committee actions affecting special access programs. It also is the responsibility of each program manager to ensure he or she is fully cognizant—through the above-mentioned liaison channels—of Committee actions affecting his or her specific program, project, or activity.

## HEARINGS

The Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations began hearings on the fiscal year 1991 budget request on February 20, 1990, and concluded them on July 19, 1990, after 22 separate sessions. The subcommittee heard testimony from representatives of the Department of Defense, other Federal agencies, and from the general public. Approximately 1,919 pages of transcript were taken, the unclassified portions of which constitute the six-volume public record of testimony on this budget request.

## SUMMARY OF THE BILL

The Committee considered a total fiscal year 1991 budget request of $287,282,674,000 in new obligational authority for the military functions of the Department of Defense, excluding military assistance, military construction, family housing and civil defense. The following table displays the major recommendations:

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Fiscal year 1990 enacted | Fiscal year 1991 request | Committee recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Title I—Military personnel | 77,758,363,000 | 79,053,700,000 | 77,753,700,000 |
| Title II—Operation and maintenance | 85,212,399,000 | 88,764,624,000 | 83,238,227,000 |
| Title III—Procurement | 83,439,577,000 | 77,288,050,000 | 65,489,817,000 |
| (By transfer) | (100,000,000) | (1,359,050,000) | |
| Title IV—Research, development, test, and evaluation | 37,033,247,000 | 38,092,800,000 | 34,140,306,000 |
| Title V—Revolving and management funds | 344,700,000 | 2,228,200,000 | 3,939,200,000 |
| Title VI—Other Department of Defense appropriations | 797,758,000 | 1,661,800,000 | 1,673,100,000 |
| Title VII—Related agencies | 192,932,000 | 193,500,000 | 193,500,000 |
| Title VIII—General provisions | −350,000,000 | | 1,813,000,000 |
| (Additional transfer authority) | (3,000,000,000) | (3,000,000,000) | (1,500,000,000) |
| Total, Department of Defense | 284,428,976,000 | 287,282,674,000 | 268,240,850,000 |
| (By transfer) | (100,000,000) | (1,359,050,000) | |
| Total funding available | 284,528,976,000 | 288,641,724,000 | 268,240,850,000 |
| (Transfer authority) | (3,000,000,000) | (3,000,000,000) | (1,500,000,000) |

## BUDGET SUMMIT AGREEMENT AND 302(b) ALLOCATION

The Appropriations Committee conformed fully to the budget resolution for defense spending in its 302(b) allocation. This allocation divided the budget authority and outlays among the subcommittees with jurisdiction over defense spending. The Defense Sub-

**committee has the far greatest share of defense spending. In this recommended bill, the Appropriations Committee has remained within the tight constraints of its 302(b) allocation for defense.**

## BUDGETARY IMPACT OF BILL

## PREPARED BY THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE PURSUANT TO SEC. 308(a), PUBLIC LAW 93-344, AS AMENDED

[In millions of dollars]

| | Budget authority | | Outlays | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Committee allocation | Amount of bill | Committee allocation | Amount of bill |
| Comparison of amounts in the bill with the Committee allocation to its subcommittees of amounts in the First Concurrent Resolution for 1991: Subcommittee on Defense | 268,242 | 268,241 | 277,759 | [1] 277,758 |
| Projections of outlays associated with budget authority recommended in the bill: | | | | |
| 1991 | | | | [2] 170,785 |
| 1992 | | | | 50,089 |
| 1993 | | | | 25,355 |
| 1994 | | | | 11,308 |
| 1995 and future year | | | | 10,704 |
| Financial assistance to State and local governments for 1991 in the bill | | | | |
| | Direct loans | | Loan guarantees | |
| Credit authority estimates, fiscal year 1991 | | | | |

[1] Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

[2] Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

# TITLE I

## MILITARY PERSONNEL

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $77,758,363,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 79,053,700,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 77,553,700,000 |

Funds appropriated under this title provide for pay and allowances, permanent change of station travel, and various other personnel costs for the uniformed members of the Armed Forces. The level of active duty military personnel requested in the President's fiscal year 1991 budget is 2,038,800, which is 37,605 below the authorized end strength for fiscal year 1990. The level of Reserve and National Guard personnel requested in the fiscal year 1991 budget is 1,151,600, or 3,400 below the end strength for fiscal year 1990.

A total of $79,053,700,000 is requested in the President's fiscal year 1991 budget for military personnel appropriations, an increase of $1,295,337,000 over fiscal year 1990. This request includes $69,623,900,000 for active duty forces and $9,429,800,000 for the Reserves and Guard.

### SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ACTION

The Committee recommends appropriations totaling $77,553,700,000 in title I, military personnel, for fiscal year 1991. This amount is $1,500,000,000 below the budget request.

The Committee fully funds authorized end strength.

Committee appropriation recommendations are displayed in the following table:

SUMMARY OF MILITARY PERSONNEL APPROPRIATIONS, TITLE I

[In thousands of dollars]

| | 1990 | Budget estimate | Committee recommendation | Committee compared with— | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 1990 | Budget |
| Military personnel, Army | 24,172,813 | 24,295,600 | 23,863,803 | −309,010 | −431,797 |
| Military personnel, Navy | 19,022,648 | 19,363,100 | 19,044,785 | 22,137 | −318,315 |
| Military personnel, Marine Corps | 5,714,474 | 5,918,600 | 5,868,652 | 154,178 | −49,948 |
| Military personnel, Air Force | 19,815,428 | 20,046,600 | 19,617,100 | −198,328 | −429,500 |
| Reserve personnel, Army | 2,201,098 | 2,337,100 | 2,322,800 | 121,702 | −14,300 |
| Reserve personnel, Navy | 1,572,181 | 1,624,600 | 1,608,100 | 35,919 | −16,500 |
| Reserve personnel, Marine Corps | 314,452 | 336,400 | 325,500 | 11,048 | −10,900 |
| Reserve personnel, Air Force | 662,837 | 684,000 | 684,110 | 21,273 | 110 |
| National Guard personnel, Army | 3,246,700 | 3,358,700 | 3,331,900 | 85,200 | −26,800 |
| National Guard personnel, Air Force | 1,035,732 | 1,089,000 | 1,086,950 | 51,218 | −2,050 |
| General PCS reduction (See section 8069) | | | −200,000 | −200,000 | −200,000 |
| Total, military personnel | 77,758,363 | 79,053,700 | 77,553,700 | −204,663 | −1,500,000 |

## MILITARY MANPOWER END STRENGTH

The following table summarizes adjustments to the 1991 manpower request for Active, Guard, and Reserve forces.

### RECOMMENDED END STRENGTH

| | 1990 estimate | Budget request | Committee recommendation | Committee compared with— | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 1990 | Budget |
| Active force: | | | | | |
| Army | 744,169 | 727,500 | 704,170 | −39,999 | −23,330 |
| Navy | 590,501 | 584,800 | 568,500 | −22,001 | −16,300 |
| Marine Corps | 196,735 | 196,500 | 193,735 | −3,000 | −2,765 |
| Air Force | 545,000 | 530,000 | 510,000 | −35,000 | −20,000 |
| Total, active | 2,076,405 | 2,038,800 | 1,976,405 | −100,000 | −62,395 |
| Reserve/Guard: | | | | | |
| Army Reserve | 309,200 | 309,200 | 309,200 | | |
| Navy Reserve | 153,400 | 149,700 | 149,700 | −3,700 | |
| Marine Corps Reserve | 44,000 | 43,900 | 43,900 | −100 | |
| Air Force Reserve | 84,900 | 85,200 | 85,591 | 691 | 391 |
| Army National Guard | 447,300 | 447,300 | 447,300 | | |
| Air National Guard | 116,200 | 116,300 | 117,498 | 1,298 | 1,198 |
| Total, Guard/Reserve | 1,155,000 | 1,151,600 | 1,153,189 | −1,811 | 1,589 |
| Total | 3,231,405 | 3,190,400 | 3,129,594 | −101,811 | −60,806 |

## FISCAL YEAR 1990 END STRENGTH

The four services, anticipating a reduction in fiscal year 1991 end strength, began reducing end strength in fiscal year 1990. The Committee recommendation includes full-year savings based upon the reduction in programmed fiscal year 1990 end strength, as follows:

| | Fiscal year 1990 actual manning | Savings |
|---|---|---|
| Army | −7,000 | $178,983,000 |
| Navy | −5,500 | 140,630,000 |
| Marine Corps | −1,000 | 25,569,000 |
| Air Force | −8,000 | 217,877,000 |
| Total | −21,500 | 563,059,000 |

The Committee recommendation reduces the military personnel accounts by the amounts indicated.

## FISCAL YEAR 1991 END STRENGTH REDUCTION

The Committee's recommendation is based upon an authorized end strength reduction in fiscal year 1991 of 100,000. The four services had included end strength reductions of 37,605 in their fiscal year 1991 budget submissions, hence the Committee's recommendation is based upon additional reductions of 62,395.

### PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION TRAVEL

The Senate-passed authorization bill reduced Department of Defense funding for permanent change of station [PCS] travel by a total of $200,000,000, and the Committee's recommendation includes this reduction. Because of the differing requirements of the four services, the recommendation does not allocate the reduction to the individual services. The Committee's recommendation includes a general provision directing the Secretary of Defense to make the allocation.

### REDUCTION IN GENERALS AND FLAG OFFICERS

The Senate-passed authorization bill reduced the authorized number of generals and flag officers in the four services by a total of 43. Based on this lowered authorization, the Committee has reduced the military personnel accounts by $2,756,000 apportioned as follows:

| | Number | Reduction |
|---|---|---|
| Army | 21 | $1,346,000 |
| Navy | 8 | 513,000 |
| Marine Corps | 2 | 128,000 |
| Air Force | 12 | 769,000 |

### MILITARY PERSONNEL IN SUPPLY ACTIVITIES

This year, the Department of Defense moved the costs associated with civilian employees working in supply activities into the stock fund accounts but did not transfer similar military personnel charges. In order to reflect the true cost of maintaining the supply system and to facilitate the type of unit cost analysis desired by the Department and to ensure consistency for personnel resource management, the Committee recommends transferring military personnel costs to the stock funds as well, as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Army | $15,300,000 |
| Navy | 32,900,000 |
| Marine Corps | 1,200,000 |
| Air Force | 46,400,000 |

### WOMEN IN THE MILITARY

American women have a long and honorable history working with the military services, a history that goes back to our beginnings as a nation. In every war this country has fought, women have served as volunteers—for example, as nurses in the American Civil War—long before they were accepted as uniformed members of a military service. It was not until World War II that women were allowed into the military services—the WAC's, WAVE's, SPAR's, and women marines—as a temporary measure brought about because of a shortage of personnel. The Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 gave military women permanent status.

When the All Volunteer Force began in the 1970's, all of the services initially had difficulty recruiting sufficient numbers of quality personnel. The problem was partially solved by the thousands of young women who volunteered to serve their country. Today, these women make up about 11 percent of our military services.

This background is offered because the Committee is concerned about the future of women in the Armed Forces. It is concerned that, as our military becomes smaller between now and 1995, the military services may make disproportionate reductions in the numbers of female service members in order to protect the jobs of male service members.

Women have proved their worth in every area of the military in which they have served, and they deserve to be treated like the dedicated professionals that they are. When the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Colin Powell, testified before the Senate Defense Appropriations Subcommittee in February of this year, he was asked if women would be treated fairly as our military forces are drawn down. He replied that the reduction in forces "will be by unit and function, certainly not by gender. I am a great supporter of women in the Armed Forces." He further said, "I cannot envision any situation where we would in some way discriminate against women as we draw the size of the force down."

The Committee applauds General Powell's statement and wishes to emphasize its interest in assuring that women are treated fairly as our military services become more compact. It would be a disgrace if women who have served their country well in both peace and war were to be unfairly discriminated against as our military becomes smaller.

## MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $24,172,813,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 24,295,600,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 23,863,803,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $23,863,803,000 for fiscal year 1991. This is $431,797,000 below the budget request.

All recommended adjustments to the budget request, including those items discussed elsewhere in the report, are summarized below:

[In thousands of dollars]

| *Program* | *Committee adjustments* |
|---|---|
| Fiscal year 1991 request | 24,295,600 |
| Military personnel in supply activities | −15,300 |
| Reduction in generals | −1,346 |
| Fiscal year 1990 actual manning | −178,983 |
| Fiscal year 1991 end strength reduction | −215,040 |
| Army college fund | −21,128 |
| Total adjustments | −431,797 |
| Recommended appropriation | 23,863,803 |

### ARMY COLLEGE FUND

Contributions made to the defense educational benefits fund for the Army college fund are determined by actuarial data. Last year, these data indicated that contributions made on behalf of the college fund have been in excess in recent years. In fiscal year 1990, the Committee deleted the Army's contribution to the benefits fund and has done so again in fiscal year 1991. These reductions are not intended to harm the Army college fund in any way, but rather are intended to bring the Army's contributions into alignment with anticipated demand.

## MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $19,022,648,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 19,363,100,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 19,044,785,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $19,044,785,000 for fiscal year 1991. This is $318,315,000 below the budget request.

All recommended adjustments to the budget request, including those items discussed elsewhere in the report, are summarized below:

[In thousands of dollars]

| *Program* | *Committee adjustments* |
|---|---|
| Fiscal year 1991 request | 19,363,100 |
| Fiscal year 1990 actual manning | −140,630 |
| Fiscal year 1991 end strength reduction | −144,272 |
| Military personnel in supply activities | −32,900 |
| Reduction in flag officers | −513 |
| Total adjustments | −318,315 |
| Recommended appropriation | 19,044,785 |

## MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $5,714,474,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 5,918,600,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 5,868,652,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $5,868,652,000 for fiscal year 1991. This is $49,948,000 below the budget request.

All recommended adjustments to the budget request, including those items discussed elsewhere in the report, are summarized below:

[In thousands of dollars]

| *Program* | *Committee adjustments* |
|---|---|
| Fiscal year 1991 request | 5,918,600 |
| Fiscal year 1990 actual manning | −25,569 |
| Fiscal year 1991 end strength reduction | −23,051 |
| Military personnel in supply activities | −1,200 |
| Reduction in generals | −128 |
| Total adjustments | −49,948 |
| Recommended appropriation | 5,868,652 |

## MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $19,815,428,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 20,046,600,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 19,617,100,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $19,617,100,000 for fiscal year 1991. This is a reduction of $429,500,000 below the budget request.

All recommended adjustments to the budget request, including those items discussed elsewhere in the report, are summarized below:

[In thousands of dollars]

| *Program* | *Committee adjustments* |
|---|---|
| Fiscal year 1991 request | 20,046,600 |
| Fiscal year 1990 actual manning | −217,877 |
| Fiscal year 1991 end strength reduction | −152,220 |
| Military personnel in supply activities | −46,400 |
| Reduction in generals | −769 |
| 250 Air Force colonels | −12,234 |
| Total adjustments | −429,500 |
| Recommended appropriation | 19,617,100 |

### GUARD AND RESERVE PERSONNEL/ISSUES

*AGR substitution.*—Section 412 of the Senate-passed Defense authorization reduced the number of active duty Guard and Reserve personnel [AGR's] by 5 percent and replaced these positions with regular active duty Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force personnel on detail to the Reserve components.

The Committee recommends a reduction of $77,840,000 for all Reserve components. This reduction takes into account funding needed to maintain paid drill strength and also recognizes that funding for this substitution is provided in the active duty military personnel accounts.

*Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard Force structure reinstatement.*—The budget proposes to deactivate five Air Force Reserve and nine Air National Guard flying and air warning and control units. The Committee annually has restored these units. The following statement from the Committee's fiscal year 1990 report is just as relevant in fiscal year 1991:

> The Committee believes that in a period of decreasing defense budgets, it makes sense to put more, not less, force structure into the Reserve components. Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard components are cost-effective and combat ready. These units require less than one-half an active unit's operation and support funding and have proven at annual competitions that they are as fully capable of performing wartime missions as the active Air Force * * * The Air Force proposal [to deactivate these units] simply does not make sense.

The Committee is disappointed that the Air Force and the Department of Defense ignored this guidance and chose instead to again delete funding and propose disestablishing these same units in fiscal year 1991. The Committee believes that the world changes that have occurred since last year only serve to underscore the importance of Guard and Reserve force structure. The Committee notes that section 1411 of the Senate-passed Defense authorization bill, S. 2884, requires a freeze on Guard and Reserve force structure.

The Committee has increased Reserve personnel, Air Force by $1,000,000 and Military personnel, Air National Guard, personnel by $6,400,000 to reinstate the 1,416 personnel in these units. Bill language is included in "Operation and maintenance, Air Force" that earmarks $43,000,000 to ensure that 395 civilian technicians and other operating support costs are maintained for these nine Air National Guard and five Air Force Reserve units. These units are as follows:

*Air National Guard.*—Channel Islands, CA, C–130 unit; March Air Force Base, CA, OA–10A and RF-4C units; Moffett, CA, HH-60G unit; Andrews, MD, F–16 unit; Kokee, HI, forward air warning control unit; Capitol, IL, F–16 unit; Suffolk, NY, HC–130 unit; and Nashville, TN, C–130 unit.

*Air Force Reserve.*—Peterson, CO, C–130 unit; Duke, FL, AC–130 unit; Portland, OR, HC–130 unit; Carswell, TX, F–16 unit; and Homestead, FL, HH-3E unit.

*Army National Guard and Reserve force structure and roundout.*—The Committee disapproves of the Army's proposal to reduce Active and Reserve forces on an equal basis. This decision is premature in light of the Department of Defense's formal review of Reserve posture.

The United States will need to rely on Reserve components more than it has in the past 40 years. This force structure and readiness can be maintained at a fraction of the cost with Reserve components.

The Committee fully supports section 1411 of the Senate-passed Defense authorization bill and directs the Army to withhold making deep reductions in its Reserve forces until the Department's total force review is complete.

The Army also should consider new and unique ways to integrate Reserve and Active component forces. The roundout system has proven to be extremely successful for both the Army's Active and Reserve components. Under a normal roundout association, two active brigades are teamed with a Guard or Reserve brigade in a division. The Committee requests that the Army establish and validate a super roundout division consisting of two Guard/Reserve brigades and one active brigade.

*Idaho National Guard Apache conversion.*—The Committee notes that there is a critical need to provide additional funding for the Idaho National Guard because of the uniqueness of transitioning directly from a UH–1M attack battalion to an AH–64 Apache battalion. The Committee understands that the Army has directed that all Apache battalions be manned at 100 percent and be equipped and trained prior to the conduct of unit training.

Therefore, the Committee directs that the Secretary of the Army provide adequate funding to provide full fielding requirements of equipment, training, and full-time technician, AGR, and active duty support personnel so that the conversion may be completed in the currently projected timeframe.

*Pacific tanker unit.*—For several years the Committee has been concerned with the lack of adequate refueling capacity based in the Pacific. The Committee is also aware that the Air Force intends to deactivate a significant number of active Air Force KC-135 tankers during the next 2 years. Therefore, the Committee directs the Air Force and Air National Guard to create a unit with not less than four KC-135 tanker aircraft at Hickam Air Force Base to address these refueling requirements.

## MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY RESERVE

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $2,201,098,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 2,337,100,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 2,322,800,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,322,800,000 for fiscal year 1991. This is $14,300,000 below the budget request.

All recommended adjustments to the budget request, including those items discussed elsewhere in the report, are summarized below:

[In thousands of dollars]

| *Program* | *Committee adjustments* |
|---|---|
| Fiscal year 1991 request | 2,337,100 |
| AGR substitutions | −14,300 |
| Total adjustments | −14,300 |
| Recommended appropriation | 2,322,800 |

## MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY RESERVE

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $1,572,181,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 1,624,600,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 1,608,100,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,608,100,000 for fiscal year 1991. This is $16,500,000 below the budget request.

All recommended adjustments to the budget request, including those items discussed elsewhere in the report, are summarized below:

[In thousands of dollars]

| *Program* | *Committee adjustments* |
|---|---|
| Fiscal year 1991 request | 1,624,600 |
| AGR substitutions | −16,500 |
| Total adjustments | −16,500 |
| Recommended appropriation | 1,608,100 |

## MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $314,452,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 336,400,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 325,500,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $325,500,000 for fiscal year 1991. This is $10,900,000 below the budget request.

All recommended adjustments to the budget request, including those items discussed elsewhere in the report, are summarized below:

[In thousands of dollars]

| *Program* | *Committee adjustments* |
|---|---|
| Fiscal year 1991 request | 336,400 |
| AGR substitutions | −10,900 |
| Total adjustments | −10,900 |
| Recommended appropriation | 5,500 |

## RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $662,837,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 684,000,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 684,110,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $684,110,000 for fiscal year 1991. This is $110,000 above the budget request.

[In thousands of dollars]

| *Program* | *Committee adjustments* |
|---|---|
| Fiscal year 1991 request | 684,000 |
| AGR substitutions | −890 |
| Force structure restoration | 1,000 |
| Total adjustments | 100 |
| Recommended appropriation | 684,110 |

## MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $3,246,700,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 3,358,700,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 3,331,900,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $3,331,900,000 for fiscal year 1991. This is $26,800,000 below the budget request.

All recommended adjustments to the budget request, including those items discussed elsewhere in the report, are summarized below:

[In thousands of dollars]

| *Program* | *Committee adjustments* |
|---|---|
| Fiscal year 1991 request | 3,358,700 |
| AGR substitutions | −26,800 |
| Total adjustments | −26,800 |
| Recommended appropriation | 3,331,900 |

## MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $1,035,732,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 1,089,000,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 1,086,950,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,086,950,000 for fiscal year 1991. This is $2,050,000 below the budget request.

All recommended adjustments in the budget request, including those items discussed elsewhere in the report, are summarized below:

[In thousands of dollars]

| *Program* | *Committee adjustments* |
|---|---|
| Fiscal year 1991 request | 1,089,000 |
| AGR substitutions | −8,450 |
| Force structure restoration | 6,400 |
| Total adjustments | −2,050 |
| Recommended appropriation | 1,086,950 |

# TITLE II

## OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $85,212,399,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 88,764,624,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 83,238,227,000 |

The Committee recommends appropriations totaling $83,238,227,000 in title II, operation and maintenance, for fiscal year 1991. This is $5,526,397,000 below the budget estimate. The Committee recommendations, by appropriation account, are compared with the budget estimate in the following table:

SUMMARY OF OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

[In thousands of dollars]

| | 1990 enacted | 1991 budget estimate | Committee recommendation | Committee compared with— | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 1990 | Budget |
| O&M Army | 22,787,559 | 23,562,900 | 21,664,190 | −1,123,369 | −1,898,710 |
| O&M Navy | 23,902,621 | 24,531,600 | 23,230,691 | −670,930 | −1,300,909 |
| O&M Marine Corps | 1,657,719 | 1,948,100 | 1,880,100 | 222,381 | −68,000 |
| O&M Air Force | 21,806,213 | 22,048,900 | 20,064,092 | −1,742,121 | −1,984,808 |
| O&M Defense Agencies | 7,800,156 | 8,663,100 | 8,148,163 | 348,007 | −514,937 |
| O&M Army Reserve | 849,423 | 890,400 | 871,360 | 21,937 | −19,040 |
| O&M Navy Reserve | 894,800 | 985,924 | 976,114 | 81,314 | −9,810 |
| O&M Marine Corps Reserve | 77,400 | 86,100 | 83,180 | 5,780 | −2,920 |
| O&M Air Force Reserve | 978,500 | 1,042,500 | 1,055,360 | 76,860 | 12,860 |
| O&M Army National Guard | 1,839,063 | 1,988,500 | 1,960,360 | 121,297 | −28,140 |
| O&M Air National Guard | 1,981,900 | 2,175,400 | 2,217,990 | 236,090 | 42,590 |
| National Rifle Board | 4,633 | 5,600 | 5,600 | 967 | .......... |
| Court of Military Appeals | 3,945 | 5,600 | 5,500 | 1,555 | −100 |
| Environmental Restoration | 601,100 | 817,000 | 1,062,527 | 461,427 | 245,527 |
| Humanitarian Assistance | 12,845 | 13,000 | 13,000 | 155 | .......... |
| Goodwill Games | 14,522 | .......... | .......... | −14,522 | .......... |
| Total O&M | 85,212,399 | 88,764,624 | 83,238,227 | −1,974,172 | −5,526,397 |

## SERVICEWIDE OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE ISSUES AND PROGRAMS—FORCE STRUCTURE AND SUPPORT

### BUDGET JUSTIFICATION MATERIAL AND ACCOUNTING INFORMATION

The Committee is concerned that the budget justification material provided by the Department in support of the fiscal year 1991 operation and maintenance [O&M] appropriations is inadequate to meet the additional tasks which will result from changes in budget policy. The material submitted by the military services and the Defense agencies does not provide sufficient detail on how almost $90,000,000,000 will be spent. These justification books focus on a marginal analysis of changes from the previous fiscal year, while

97 percent of the budget is simply explained as last year's funding level. An example of the problems which result was the Navy's inability to provide information on the number of steaming hours budgeted for each of the numbered fleets, despite the innumerable working days spent in developing more than 1,500 pages of O&M justification material submitted to Congress.

Further, the current justification material fails to provide an audit trail between appropriations enacted for operation and maintenance and the funding proposed for execution. The Department makes significant changes from the amounts appropriated in prior years without providing any description of the revisions being made.

The most useful justification document is the "Operation and Maintenance Overview" prepared and submitted by the Office of the Secretary of Defense. This document provides information on similar types of activities rather than on somewhat arbitrary budget groupings which are not related to the output of the Department.

The Committee also notes that there is minimal accountability to Congress for execution of operation and maintenance appropriations. Accounting information provided to indicate how funds are being spent is available only at the most summary level. It is not possible to determine how appropriated funds are being expended and whether the services are complying with congressional direction. The level of accounting detail provided for the RDT&E and procurement appropriations is the minimum necessary for effective execution of congressional oversight responsibilities. In an era of decreasing budgetary resources and an environment in which the Department has repeatedly proposed budget reforms that shift costs into the O&M accounts, improvements in O&M justification and accounting information are essential.

The Committee has supported many of the Department's fiscal year 1991 initiatives to consolidate funding into the O&M accounts and revolving funds. For example, procurement of repairable spare parts will now be funded through the supply system and O&M customer accounts. These actions were supported because the end result is expected to be reduced costs from more informed decisionmaking by the services. The Committee, however, will not entertain additional transfers to the O&M appropriations without improved justification and accountability.

In order to improve the information available for O&M accounts, the Department is directed to improve the fiscal year 1992 justification by:

—Providing an O&M-1 similar to the P-1 and R-1 submitted for the procurement and RDT&E appropriations. This should show the budget activity, activity group, and subactivity group for the same years as the P-1/R-1.

—Focusing the activity group/subactivity group on measurable output. For example, an activity group could be F-15 aircraft, with subactivity groups such as flying hours costs, base operating support, real property maintenance, administrative costs, and depot maintenance.

—Reflecting activity groups and subactivity groups on the DD-1414 (base for reprogramming). Reprogramming threshold will be at the activity group level.

—Providing accounting information at the activity group level.

Changes are also required in the stock fund overview. This document provides information on the planned execution of the various revolving funds used by the Department to maintain defense-related stocks. As noted above, the Committee supports transfer of repairable spare parts procurement to O&M customer accounts. This action is accomplished through the stock funds. Documentation must be provided in the justification material which informs Congress about planned procurement at the same level of detail as provided when these items were funded in the procurement appropriations. Information on execution of the procurement program is also to be included. In addition, the Department should ensure that accounting data is available to the defense oversight committees at the same level of detail as provided under the procurement appropriations.

The Committee looks forward to determining jointly with the Department the exact details of the revisions.

## PROCEDURES FOR USING TRANSFER AUTHORITY

In section 8007 Congress provides authority to the Department of Defense to transfer funds between and among the many accounts included in the Defense Appropriations Act. Procedures for notification of Congress regarding use of this authority, agreed to by the Defense Department and the Defense Oversight Committees, are detailed in DOD Manual 7110-1M.

The Committee has at various times provided additional authority to the Secretary of Defense allowing transfer of funds for specific purposes, such as Operation Just Cause and Hurricane Hugo. The Defense Department has not uniformly applied accepted reprogramming procedures, including the submission of DD-1415 requests, in notifying the Defense Oversight Committees of the use of this authority. Because the alternative notification information provided by the Department does not provide the data necessary for complete evaluation of either requirements or funding sources, the Committee has previously directed that standard reprogramming procedures be applied to these transfer requests. In order to ensure future compliance with this direction, section 8007 has been modified so that any use of transfer authority available to the Defense Department must comply fully with the established procedures.

## CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

The Committee believes that the Department of Defense's experiment in managing without civilian personnel ceilings should be discontinued. The Department's current system which delinks civilian personnel strengths from the budget is unwise and results in unnecessary turbulence to the work force. The Committee notes that with respect to management of military personnel, the Department of Defense does employ sound management that ensures that end strength and average strength be adjusted commensurate with the means to pay personnel.

Managing without limits on civilian personnel strengths invariably has resulted in a mismatch between the number of people employed and the funds to pay them. Service components annually refer to onboard personnel for whom funds are not included in the budget. Increasingly, the military services are compensating for this mismatch by: (1) transferring funds away from priority readiness programs; (2) reprogramming funds from investment programs justified in other appropriation accounts; or (3) resorting to furloughs and reductions in force to bring civilian personnel levels in line with projections.

In supporting its management-without-ceilings policy, the Department of Defense has argued that civilian personnel are a resource, not a program. In theory, this argument is sound. However, with 43 percent of the operation and maintenance budget needed for civilian pay alone, this is a policy fraught with too many problems. The current Federal civilian personnel system simply does not provide for a means to rapidly adjust the work force downward when funding inevitably is not available.

Behind the statistics of end strength and grade levels, real men and women hold positions. The current system often treats them unfairly, because it does not ensure that their pay is included in the budget. Instead, the Department often turns to short-term, draconian solutions to bring personnel levels in line with available payroll.

The Committee recommends bill language, section 8016, to avoid these problems by ensuring that civilian personnel levels and the budget are relinked.

*Japanese American Museum.*—The Committee directs the Department of Defense to provide $4,000,000 for the establishment of the Japanese American Museum as a component of the proposed Japanese American Cultural Center in Ontario, OR. The Committee recognizes that the area in and around Ontario, OR, was classified as a free zone during World War II, and attracted as many as 5,000 Japanese Americans during and after the war. The Japanese American Museum will commemorate those American citizens who were denied the protection accorded all American citizens under the Bill of Rights, and were detained in internment camps in the Western United States for the duration of the war. In addition, the museum will recognize the important contributions that were made by those Japanese Americans who served in the United States military with great distinction in both the Pacific and European theaters of war.

The proposed Japanese American Cultural Center will be cost shared through a Federal/State/local arrangement. The Federal share will be utilized solely on the museum portion of the project. It is the Committee's understanding that the State and local share of the project is expected to be approximately $5,000,000.

## OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE GENERAL SUPPORT TO MILITARY PERSONNEL

In title I, military personnel, the Committee has recommended full funding of the authorized end strength—a reduction of 62,395 military end strength from the level requested in the budget, a total reduction of 100,000 from the fiscal year 1990 authorized number. This recommendation has a direct impact on the support funding included in the operation and maintenance [O&M] appropriations.

Each military position requires approximately $9,000 annually in O&M support for such things as supplies, transportation, base operations, equipment maintenance, and operational training. This funding estimate understates total O&M support costs since it does not include support and overhead functions which cannot be directly related to military end strength, but obviously will be affected by changes in force levels.

As noted by the Committee last year, the Department cannot or will not provide estimates for changes in these categories when addressing the impact of force reductions. As force levels continue to decline it is important that the impact of these changes on headquarters, transportation, administration, and similar efforts must be identified.

For fiscal year 1991, the Committee recommends a reduction of $4,000 for each additional military end strength deleted in the Senate-passed authorization bill, on the basis that other adjustments (discussed below) also address changes in force levels.

## TRAINING AND EDUCATION

Funding for military personnel training and education is requested in the relevant operation and maintenance appropriation. Included in these costs are the service schools and colleges, DOD and joint-service schools, and the military academies. The Defense budget includes an increase for training and education in both fiscal year 1990 and fiscal year 1991 despite the force reductions budgeted for those years. The total increase since fiscal year 1989 is $440,000,000, more than 15-percent growth even though military end strength declines more than 7 percent during the same period.

The Committee denies the additional $300,000,000 requested by the Department in fiscal year 1991 for training and education. In addition, distribution of the remaining funding among the services and agencies is adjusted to reflect the comparatively greater change in Army force structure and end strength.

The Committee is also seriously concerned about the large number of schools and colleges maintained by the Department. In addition to joint schools, each of the services maintains a war college, a command and staff college, and academies for senior noncommissioned officers. It appears to the Committee that there is a significant opportunity to achieve savings and promote efficiencies, without degrading the quality of education offered, by consolidating some of these schools and eliminating duplication. The Committee does not, at this time, recommend any specific consolidations but does wish to alert the Department of Defense to its interest and to make clear that consolidation of service schools and colleges will be considered in the next budget cycle.

### RECRUITING, ADVERTISING, AND EXAMINING

The budget requests an increase for recruiting, advertising, and examining efforts over the fiscal year 1990 appropriated level even though accessions are expected to decline and the pool of eligible recruits may very well increase as a result of changes in the economic environment. The Committee recommends reducing the Department's more than $700,000,000 (excluding military salaries) budget for recruiting and advertising by $85,500,000 on the basis that the inexorable laws of supply and demand will cause the cost of both new enlistments and reenlistments to decline significantly.

Further, in view of the large number of Active duty personnel who will be leaving the Active Forces, the Guard and Reserve will have no problem finding large numbers of qualified personnel. Accordingly, the Guard and Reserve recruiting and advertising budget can be reduced $33,260,000.

### GREATER USE OF RESERVES

The Committee recommendation reduces operation and maintenance funding by $40,600,000 to reflect direction provided in the Senate-approved defense authorization to increase the use of Reserve forces. The Committee strongly supports the transfer of missions and equipment to the Guard and Reserve as tensions between the major world powers are reduced. The ability of the Guard and Reserves to contribute to lower intensity conflicts has been amply demonstrated in the Just Cause and Desert Shield operations.

### RETIRING OLDER SYSTEMS

The Committee recommends a reduction of $100,000,000 to reflect decreased operations of older single-purpose weapon systems as approved in the Senate-passed authorization. With the significant changes in Eastern Europe, the force reductions which have been authorized and the increasingly severe budget problems, it is clear that accelerated retirement of obsolete combat systems is essential to the continued success of U.S. Armed Forces.

As military personnel and defense missions are transferred from the Active Forces to the Guard and Reserve, equipment allowing accomplishment of assigned missions must be transferred also. This process has occurred in the past as more modern, easily maintained systems are procured for Active Forces, allowing older systems to transition to Guard and Reserve. It must be accelerated to improve both the Active and Guard and Reserve capabilities as total force levels decline. The accelerated transition will reduce costs for the Guard and Reserve as F-16 aircraft and M-1 tanks replace F-4 aircraft and M-60 tanks. It will also reduce costs for the Active Forces as equipment excess to requirements is transferred.

## CIVILIAN PAY

In January, the Secretary of Defense directed implementation of a hiring freeze. This action was required to align the number of civilian employees with the budgeted workload. As a direct result of the Secretary's action, the number of Department civilian employees at the beginning of fiscal year 1991 will be 30,000 lower than the budgeted level. The Committee sees no need to restore these employees during fiscal year 1991 and accordingly reduces funding by $823,700,000 to reflect the lower personnel costs.

The Committee also recommends reducing the budget by $284,800,000 to reflect a continuation of a partial hiring freeze during fiscal year 1991, providing funding to pay for one new employee for each two that leave during fiscal year 1991. As noted by this Committee last year, it is necessary to revise the number of civilian employees consistent with changes in the size of military forces. Based on the 62,395 additional military personnel reduction contemplated in the Senate-passed authorization, 32,800 fewer civilian employees will be required in fiscal year 1991 (medical personnel are to be exempted). Experience in fiscal year 1990 indicates that a one-for-two hiring policy during fiscal year 1991 will effect the necessary reduction.

## FOREIGN NATIONAL CIVILIANS

The Committee recommends a reduction of $207,100,000 to the fiscal year 1991 budget to reflect the 15-percent reduction in foreign national employment directed in the Senate-approved Defense authorization bill. With the reduction in overseas stationed military personnel, the amount of civilian support can also be reduced. The ceiling on overseas work-years contained in section 8058 has been appropriately revised.

## DEFICIENCIES IN MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCES

This Committee recognizes the serious threat to our Nation's future productivity resulting from educational deficiencies in the areas of mathematics and science. To address this problem, the Committee encourages the Department of Defense and other Federal agencies to promote and maintain a competent Federal work force in mathematics- and science-related areas, and to undertake efforts to encourage students to pursue the study of mathematics and science in their educational endeavors.

## ADMINISTRATION AND OTHER OVERHEAD COSTS

*Banking support.*—The Committee recommends deleting the $30,000,000 requested for support of overseas banking services. The Department has for several years contracted with a U.S. bank to provide financial services to overseas personnel comparable to those available in the United States. The Committee notes that most commercial operations at overseas bases are operated at a profit, providing income for morale, welfare, and recreation programs. If fast food restaurants located on military bases can operate at a profit, the Committee believes there is no reason why financial institutions cannot do the same.

*Real property maintenance.*—The Committee recommends reducing funding for property maintenance by $600,000,000 as approved in the Senate-approved authorization. While operation and maintenance funding in total has decreased in real terms since fiscal year 1988, funding for maintenance of property has increased by more than $300,000,000. It is also noted that a significant portion of the fiscal year 1991 increase is requested for overseas bases. In fiscal year 1991 alone, the Army has requested more than $250,000,000 for major repair projects in Europe, while forces stationed there are declining. As forces are returned from Europe, maintenance costs should decline from the fiscal year 1990 level.

*Base operations.*—Funding requested for base operations provides administrative, facility, and other support services. The budget request includes an increase of $825,200,000 to enhance services such as installation command administration, manpower management, and utilities. While a significant portion of this increase is due to price changes, $262,400,000 represents program growth and is accordingly deleted. The Committee recommended reduction maintains the fiscal year 1990 level of support for this budget category.

## STOCK FUND EXECUTION

The Department operates the Defense supply system in a manner similar to commercial business. The mechanism by which the system is managed is called the stock fund. At any point in time the stock fund product managers can be involved in three types of transactions: ordering new materiel, paying for materiel delivered from previous orders, and selling materiel to the operating forces. The materiel ordered is generally delivered in the subsequent fiscal year due to the manufacturing leadtimes. Funds to pay for the materiel are generated by the sales in that fiscal year.

During fiscal year 1990, the Defense Department took action to curtail one of these activities—ordering new materiel. Specifically, the Department constrained obligations to 70 percent of sales. This action was taken in consideration of the expected reduction in force size, making smaller inventories possible.

The Committee strongly supports the Secretary in this management effort. In order to ensure continuation of this effort, the Committee directs that the Secretary of Defense limit defense stock fund obligations in fiscal year 1991 to not more than 80 percent of gross sales from such stock funds during that fiscal year, including issues of Army and Air Force repairables. This limitation excludes fuel, commissary, and subsistence items. The Secretary of Defense may waive these limitations if a determination is made that additional purchases are required to support operational requirements in the interest of national security. The Secretary of Defense must notify the Senate and House of Representatives, Committees on Appropriation and Armed Services within 15 days after such a determination is made.

Reduction in inventories will result in an increase of $1,157,300 in stock fund cash, which will be available to transfer for other requirements. The Committee recommends using this excess cash to recapitalize the "Foreign currency, defense" account.

## INVENTORY MANAGEMENT

The Committee is greatly concerned about the major problems identified by the General Accounting Office in the management of spares. Innumerable GAO reports over the past year have detailed problems with management of these stocks, including excess procurements, lack of knowledge about what parts are available in the system, procurement of parts for systems which are being phased out, and flawed data bases. Identification of these problems has resulted in enhanced management attention in all levels of the Department. It is expected that this will result in reduced funding requirements in fiscal year 1991 and future years as those problems are corrected. The Committee accordingly recommends reducing funding for procurement of spare parts by 7.5 percent, a total reduction of $560,000,000.

## PROPERTY DISPOSAL

The Senate-passed authorization bill includes a change in accrediting receipts from sale of excess stock fund secondary items. Currently the Department receives no direct credit for proceeds from sale of these items; any receipts must be deposited with the Treasury. The direction to return receipts to the defense stock fund which declared the equipment to be excess will provide incentive to increase sales, making additional cash available for transfer to other requirements. The Committee estimates that $250,000,000 will be collected during fiscal year 1991 as a result of the new direction. The Committee recommends using this excess cash to recapitalize the "Foreign currency fluctuation, defense" account.

## COMMAND, CONTROL, AND COMMUNICATIONS

The Committee recommends reducing the level of growth for Defense communications efforts in accordance with the Senate-passed authorization. In addition, recommendation denies excess growth in Air Force programs such as: the National Emergency Airborne Command post sustaining engineering, engineering and installation, worldwide military command and control system ADP and information system, national military command center, and AFOC headquarters operations. The total recommended reduction is $145,532,000.

## CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS

The Committee recommends a reduction of $76,502,000 from the budget for classified programs. These programmatic adjustments are explained in a classified annex to this report.

## STOCK FUND OPERATIONS COST ADJUSTMENT

In order to show the true costs of spare parts consumed by the operating commands, the Department included civilian personnel costs in stock fund prices starting in fiscal year 1991. Directly related military personnel costs, however, were omitted. The Department also incorrectly included costs which were not directly related to stock fund operations, while excluding other applicable costs.

The Committee recommends reducing service operation and maintenance appropriations by total of $46,900,000 to reflect the correct cost allocation. Offsetting adjustments have been made to service military personnel and stock fund accounts.

### ENERGY

*Domestic consumption of coal.*—In its report on the fiscal year 1990 defense appropriations bill, the Committee referred to its efforts to increase consumption of coal in the United States. The Committee also expressed its dismay that, though the Department of Defense had met 95 percent of its goal to increase consumption of bituminous coal by 1994, it had not had similar success in increasing domestic consumption of anthracite coal. The Committee again expresses its intention that the Department shall continue, without modification, its efforts to increase domestic consumption of coal, as outlined in the Department's letter signed by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Logistics, dated August 30, 1985. It simply does not make sense to this Committee that the Department is willing to continue to rely on imported fuel products at a time when world instability is causing wide fluctuations in price and availability—fluctuations in price are generally upward and in availability downward—and when domestic fuel is readily available.

*Modernization of DOD heating facilities in Europe.*—The conferees on the fiscal year 1990 defense bill included language directing the Secretary of the Air Force to make a good faith effort to work with the American coal community in evaluating their proposal to convert heating systems in the Kaiserslautern military community [KMC] to United States anthracite coal and in Wiesbaden to third-party cogeneration systems using bituminous coal. (The Kaiserslautern military community is comprised of American installations at Kaiserslautern East, Kaiserslautern West, Ramstein Air Base and Landstuhl Regional Army Medical Center.) Just as requests for proposals were about to go out asking for bids for the KMC conversions, providing specifically for consideration of third-party cogeneration systems using anthracite coal, the city of Kaiserslautern passed a city ordnance mandating that conversion should be to a district heating system and specifically mandating that the American installations at Kaiserslautern East and Kaiserslautern West would be connected to the proposed district heating system. At this point, the requests for proposals were put on hold and have not as yet been issued.

Further, the Committee understands that the Air Force now intends to separate Ramstein and Landstuhl from the KMC and to issue requests for proposals for modernization at these installations. The Committee directs the Department of the Air Force not to make this separation and to continue to explore options for the entire KMC.

The Committee has included a general provision (section 8009) which prohibits the use of any funds appropriated in the Fiscal Year 1991 Defense Appropriations Act to convert any heating facility at American installations in the KMC to district heat, direct natural gas, or other sources of fuel unless the United States coal industry has had the opportunity to provide thermal energy supply to the KMC facilities through participation in a competitive solicitation for proposals for a third-party thermal energy supply. The Committee wishes to make clear that no conversions at the KMC for American military installations may take place during fiscal year 1991 until this condition and other conditions set forth in the general provision are met.

During this time when the prices of oil and natural gas are soaring, the U.S. coal industry should be in a position to provide cost-effective heat to American installations in the KMC. Accordingly, the Committee requests that the Department of the Air Force submit a brief report 90 days after the enactment of this act detailing the cost projection approach used to evaluate prices of different fuels for the regional district heating concepts under consideration for KMC. The Committee also requests that the General Accounting Office review the findings in the Department's report and continue to monitor the progress of the Air Force's contracting efforts.

The provision also prohibits the purchase of foreign coal or coke when American coal is available and prohibits conversion of heating plants from coal to oil or natural gas, except as provided in section 2690 of title 10, U.S.C., and 30 days after the Secretary of Defense has notified the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate.

## OVERSEAS WORKLOAD PROGRAM

The Committee recommends bill language making funds for the Overseas Workload Program [OWP] available to firms of any member nation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO], or of any major non-NATO ally, eligible to bid on any contract for the maintenance, repair, or overhaul of equipment of the Department of Defense. Such contracts are to be awarded under competitive procedures. For purposes of this section, Israel is to be considered in the European theater; its firms shall be entitled to bid competitively, and without discrimination, on the full range of contracts available to other states qualifying under the Overseas Workload Program.

The Committee also directs that contracts awarded under the OWP may be performed in the theater in which the equipment is normally located or in the country in which the firm is located. The Committee includes bill language directing the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress, no later than March 31, 1991, on the nature of the maintenance, repair, and overhaul work of the Department of Defense performed under the Overseas Workload Program.

According to the Air Force, the OWP has grown from $5,000,000 in fiscal year 1981 to $193,000,000 in fiscal year 1988. The Committee agrees with the judgment of the Air Force Logistics Command [AFLC] and the operating commands that the Overseas Workload Program has improved readiness and sustainability. The Committee encourages the Department of Defense generally, and the Air Force specifically, to expand the OWP to identify and develop new specialized capabilities in depot maintenance and repair in Israel.

The Committee expects the Department of Defense to consider the special depot maintenance capabilities found in Israel, with its highly educated labor force and unique experience with United States combat systems. The repair and maintenance of F-15's and the conversion of 400 United States F-4 aircraft to drones are two areas where the Committee believes Israel may have a technical edge. The Secretary of Defense shall report to the Committee, no later than March 31, 1991, on its findings and timetable for implementation of the fiscal year 1991 overseas workload program.

## SEARCH AND RESCUE SYSTEMS

The National Guard created the 210th Air Search and Rescue Squadron of the Air National Guard in July 1990 to support DOD and civilian aviation and maritime rescue requirements in Alaska. The unique environmental conditions along the Cook Inlet, AK complicate the shared disaster response and rescue operations of the Air National Guard, the U.S. Coast Guard, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, State, and local authorities.

To respond to these unique requirements, the Committee directs the Air National Guard, the U.S. Coast Guard, and FEMA to consult with State and local authorities, and report to the House of Representatives and Senate Committees on Appropriations on how to respond to the characteristics of the Cook Inlet. Specifically, the Committee expects this report to evaluate the utility of hovercraft to respond to both aviation and maritime accidents, and consider the use of hovercraft by Government and private organizations in such missions. This report should be provided not later than March 14, 1991.

## FUNDED ENVIRONMENTAL AND MORALE LEAVE PROGRAM

The Funded Environmental and Morale Leave [FEML] Program provides an opportunity for military personnel and their dependents at remote and isolated or hazardous duty locations to return on leave during their overseas assignment. Currently, personnel assigned to over 60 locations worldwide qualify for FEML.

The extraordinary security measures imposed on U.S. military personnel and their families stationed in the Philippines represent a genuine hardship. These measures are appropriate, and the Committee endorses the actions taken by the commanding officers in the Philippines to ensure the safety of U.S. personnel.

Recognizing the uncertainty over condition in the Philippines, the Committee directs that the Secretary of Defense add the Republic of the Philippines to the FEML Program. Personnel stationed in the Philippines shall remain eligible for the FEML Program until 30 days after the Secretary of Defense has certified to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations that security conditions in the Philippines have improved sufficiently that existing restrictions on U.S. personnel and their dependents are canceled.

### CURRENCY FLUCTUATION

The Department of Defense incurs significant costs overseas which are affected by changes in currency exchange rates. The defense budget is developed based on expected values of the dollar relative to currencies in countries where the Department undertakes major efforts, such as Germany and Japan. Since submission of the fiscal year 1991 budget, the dollar has experienced a reduction in value relative to the Japanese yen and German mark, causing a shortfall in the budget for activities planned in these countries. The Committee recommends an increase of $248,300,000 to accommodate these increased costs.

### CORPORATE INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

The corporate information management [CIM] initiative is a constructive effort undertaken by the Department of Defense to ensure the standardization, quality, and consistency of data from DOD's multiple administrative management information systems. The initiative has three objectives: to identify and implement management efficiencies in support of business areas throughout the information system life cycle; to eliminate duplication of efforts in the development of multiple information systems designed to meet a single functional requirement; and to ensure information systems support policy directions.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense [OSD] requested $100,000,000 in fiscal year 1991 funding to operate, modernize, and procure standard information systems under this initiative. Working groups have been convened to determine functional requirements for medical, civilian payroll, Government-furnished equipment, financial operations, civilian personnel, materiel management, and contract payment functions. At the same time, however, the services' and defense agencies' fiscal year 1991 budget requests also contain $2,100,000,000 to develop new systems or modernize current systems. The Committee believes that continued investment by the services and defense agencies in developing new systems or expanding existing systems must be carefully monitored as the Department transitions to standardized information systems.

The Committee strongly supports the concept of the CIM initiative, and recognizes the value of standardized automated information systems. However, the Committee is frustrated with the limited progress of the working groups, and their failure to identify interim standard systems for the working group areas.

The Committee is particularly concerned by the fiscal year 1991 requests for automated logistics support systems. During its review of the budget submission, the Committee identified funding requests for 37 different automated logistics support systems among the services. The Army requested $166,269,000 for 15 systems; the Navy requested $180,552,000 for 13 systems, and the Air Force requested $126,983,000 for 9 systems. In addition, the Defense Logistics Agency requested $164,467,000 for development and modernization of its automated logistics support systems. While the Committee realizes that not all of these systems fall under the CIM initiative, it is concerned that the Department has not canceled or stopped development of any system that is being considered as a CIM candidate.

In addition, the Committee does not believe the Department has adequately addressed all aspects of the CIM initiative. The Department has identified $3,202,700,000 in savings it expects to realize through standardization and consolidation for the fiscal year 1991–95 period. However, the Department has not identified the anticipated investment costs associated with the development of interim standard systems, or the integration of existing systems to the interim standard architecture.

The Committee is aware that the Department is considering consolidation of ADP functions as part of the continuing defense management review effort. The Committee strongly supports this concept and would consider CIM an appropriate effort for central management under this organizational structure. The Committee directs the Department of Defense to study other organizational alternatives for the CIM program office, (that is, services as executive agents) and present a list of alternative arrangements with the fiscal year 1992 budget submission.

The Committee also directs the services to submit future budget requests for CIM-related systems or new start programs through the CIM coordinator, with the exception of those associated with computer-aided acquisition and logistics support [CALS], which is addressed further below.

In the text which follows, the Committee provides descriptions of specific programmatic recommendations.

## DOD-WIDE REDUCTIONS

To assist OSD in its efforts to develop standardized automated information systems, section 8078 of this report appropriates $1,000,000,000 to the Secretary of Defense for the modernization and expansion of automated data processing systems. This recommendation reduces the $1,374,961,000 fiscal year 1991 operation and maintenance funding requested by the services and defense agencies by $374,961,000.

## REDUCTIONS IN PROCUREMENT

The table below summarizes recommended reductions to service and defense agency procurement funds requested for expanding or modernizing automated data processing systems which are related to the CIM initiative.

Further reductions to automated data processing programs, unrelated to the CIM initiative, are discussed in the other procurement sections of the services and defense agencies.

| *Item* | *Thousands* |
|---|---|
| Army (P-1 line 110): | |
| Army standard information system | −$1,886 |
| Financial management automation | −9,104 |
| AMC information processing equipment | −8,278 |
| Subtotal | −19,268 |
| Navy: | |
| (P-1 line 295): | |
| Regional data automation centers | −4,500 |

| *Item* | |
|---|---|
| MIS for air engineering centers | −6,409 |
| Military Sealift Command ADP | −1,033 |
| Engineering data management information and control system | −16,453 |
| Subtotal | −28,395 |
| (P-1 line 296): | |
| Stock point ADP replacement | −11,623 |
| Inventory control point resolicitation | −14,549 |
| Navy standard technical information system | −2,734 |
| NALCOMIS | −20,262 |
| Central processing and distribution | −1,112 |
| Navy occupational health information management system | −1,443 |
| Triservice micropharmacy and food service systems | −505 |
| Subtotal | −52,228 |
| Air Force: | |
| Requirements data bank (P-1 line 136) | −2,946 |
| Clinical and diagnostic systems | −1,084 |
| DMMIS (P-1 line 189) | −37,000 |
| Subtotal | −41,030 |
| Defense agencies: | |
| Standard automated materiel management system immediate improvement initiative | −14,000 |
| Cataloging tool on-line | −6,500 |
| Engineering data management information and control system | −13,275 |
| Subtotal | −33,775 |

### ARMY REDUCTIONS

*Army standard information system.*—The Committee recommends a reduction of $1,886,000, the level of funding requested for fiscal year 1991. Continued hardware upgrades for a system which will be recompeted in fiscal year 1992 is not an appropriate use of ADP funds. However, the Committee commends the Army's strategy for its follow-on sustaining base information system which emphasizes an open systems architecture.

*Financial management automation.*—The Committee recommends a reduction of $9,104,000, the amount requested to replace the mainframe computer system which supports the Army level accounting system at the Army Finance and Accounting Center. The CIM financial management working group is in the process of developing DOD-wide financial management standards for ADP support. Complete replacement of this system without reference to the ongoing CIM effort defeats the purpose of the standardization efforts.

*AMC information processing equipment.*—The Committee recommends a reduction of $8,278,000, the amount requested for AMC information processing equipment and the integrated procurement system. The Committee believes that centralized management is the most effective method of achieving the standardization of DOD-wide logistics management systems. Therefore, the Committee has transferred $2,810,000 requested for the digital storage and retrieval engineering data system to the OSD computer-aided acquisition and logistics support [CALS] program; the balance of the funding is denied. The Committee directs the Army to request future funding for this program through the CALS coordinator. The Committee does not support continued service-unique development of CALS-related systems.

## NAVY REDUCTIONS

*Data automation centers.*—The Committee does not support the Navy's request for $4,500,000 to continue consolidation of computer environments among the Navy's regional data automation centers. Continuation of service-unique hardware and software upgrades conflicts with the CIM objective to eliminate multiple information systems designed to meet a single functional need and implement DOD-wide management efficiencies throughout the information system life cycle.

*Management information systems for air engineering centers and Military Sealift Command automated data processing equipment.*—The Committee does not support software development programs which duplicate the corporate information management initiative to standardize DOD's automated data processing systems. Therefore, the Committee reduces the appropriation for air engineering centers by $6,409,000, and the appropriation for Military Sealift Command ADP equipment by $1,033,000.

*Engineering data management information and control system [EDMICS].*—The Committee recommends the deletion of $16,453,000, requested for EDMICS because the General Accounting Office reported that these funds will not be put on contract until fiscal year 1992. At the present time, EDMICS has not received deployment approval, and the Committee will not support service attempts to circumvent the life cycle management principles of the Department of Defense. The Committee directs the Navy to submit future funding requests for EDMICS through the OSD CALS program coordinator.

*Stock point automated data processing replacement.*—The stock point ADP replacement [SPAR] project is designed to replace the computer systems at Navy stock points and modernize software. However, as a result of the defense management review, more than one-half of the system's requirements have been deleted. The Committee believes the Navy should reexamine its requirements and rejustify the need for this program before attempting any further modernization efforts. Therefore, the Committee recommends the deletion of $11,623,000, the fiscal year 1991 funding level. The Committee directs the Navy to submit future funding requests for materiel management systems through the CIM program director for coordination and review.

*Inventory control point [ICP] resolicitation.*—The ICP project was a two-stage project to: (1) replace obsolete computers at the aviation supply office and the ships parts control center; and (2) modernize the replacement computers to support redesigned and extended applications of software. However, one of the defense management report decisions has called for the consolidation of inventory control points, making the need for continued modernization unclear. Therefore, the Committee recommends the reduction of $14,549,000, and directs the Navy to revalidate requirements for consolidated ICP's before attempting further modernization efforts.

The Committee directs the Navy to submit future funding requests for materiel management systems through the CIM program director for coordination and review.

*Navy standard technical information system.*— The Navy standard technical information system is designed to bring state-of-the-art document storage and retrieval systems to the Navy's engineering data repositories and technical libraries. The first phase of this project, called the engineering data management information and control system, is a component of the computer-aided acquisition logistics support system. The Committee's recommendation transfers the $2,734,000 requested for this system to the CALS program in "Procurement, defense agencies."

*Naval aviation logistics command information system [NALCOMIS].*—NALCOMIS is designed to improve management of aircraft maintenance and supply support operations, automating the recordkeeping and management reporting associated with those operations. Although this system has been in development since 1977, the General Accounting Office reported that NALCOMIS is not ready for deployment due to limited testing. The Committee will not support a deployment decision which violates DOD life-cycle management principles for major automated information systems and section 8026 of this report. As discussed elsewhere in this section, the Committee does not support continued investment in service-unique systems which are candidates for standardization or consolidation under the CIM initiative. Therefore, the Committee recommends the deletion of $20,262,000, requested for NALCOMIS in fiscal year 1991.

*Central processing and distribution [CPD] system.*—The CPD system automates medical end use stockrooms, exchanges, and surgical carts. CPD manages stockroom items, cart/customer supply area items, and financial accounting for installations of the Naval Medical Command. The Committee recommends the transfer of the $1,112,000 requested for CPD from the Naval Medical Command to the defense medical support activity [DMSA] in "Procurement, defense agencies." The DMSA is the OSD program office for the CIM medical systems working group. The Navy is directed to coordinate all future funding requests for medical support systems through the CIM executive for medical programs.

*Naval occupational health information management system.*—This system provides information related to exposure to occupational hazards, evidence of compliance with Naval occupational safety and health standards, and the measurement of program effectiveness and accomplished workloads. The Committee recommends the transfer of $1,443,000 from the Naval Medical Command to the defense medical support activity [DMSA] in "Procurement, defense agencies." DMSA is the OSD program office for the CIM medical systems working group. The Navy is directed to coordinate all future funding requests for health information systems through the CIM executive for medical programs.

*Triservice micropharmacy and triservice food service systems.*—The Committee recommends the transfer of $505,000 from the Navy Medical Command to the DMSA program office in "Procurement, defense agencies." For over 10 years, DOD has been developing composite health care system [CHCS] as a state-of-the-art ADP system to support inpatient and outpatient services. Section 8026 of this report discusses further deployment of the CHCS system. The Navy is directed to submit all future funding requests for CHCS component systems through the CIM executive for medical programs.

### AIR FORCE REDUCTIONS

*Requirements data bank.*—The Committee does not support the enhancement and expansion of a system which is being considered for consolidation under the CIM initiative. The CIM materiel management working group is developing DOD-wide logistics standards. Therefore, the Committee recommends the deletion of $2,946,000 requested for fiscal year 1991. The Air Force is directed to request future logistics system funding through the OSD CIM program.

*Clinical and diagnostic systems.*—The Committee has transferred the $1,084,000 requested for this program to the defense medical support activity in "Procurement, defense agencies." The Air Force is directed to submit future funding requests for medical ADP system upgrades, expansions, or new starts to the CIM executive responsible for medical programs.

*Depot maintenance management information system [DMMIS].*—The Committee does not support the deployment of automated information systems which violate section 8026 of this report. According to the General Accounting Office, DMMIS has encountered major development problems and significant cost and schedule growth. In addition, the Major Automated Information System Review Committee has not reviewed DMMIS for engineering development or deployment, or accepted the Air Force's risk management plan. As discussed elsewhere in this section, the Committee strongly supports the CIM initiative, and the development of standard information systems designed to meet a single functional requirement. Accordingly, the Committee recommends no funds be appropriated for this system in fiscal year 1991, and directs the Air Force to submit future funding requests for materiel management systems to the CIM coordinator.

### DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY REDUCTIONS

*Standard automated materiel management system immediate improvement initiative [SAMMS* $I^3$*].*—The SAMMS $I^3$ program is designed to replace the current data base computer platform used by DLA supply centers. The Committee does not support funding for the enhancement of an integrated materiel management system which is a candidate for consolidation under the CIM initiative. Therefore, the Committee recommends the deletion of the $14,000,000 requested for this program in fiscal year 1991. DLA is directed to submit future funding requests for materiel management automated systems through the OSD CIM program for coordination and review.

*Cataloging tool on-line [CTOL].*—CTOL acquisition is designed to replace the present manual cataloging system in use at all of the DLA supply centers. The goal of CTOL is to improve SAMMS efficiency with the purchase of state-of-the-art equipment. As discussed above, the Committee does not support the enhancement of an integrated materiel management system which is a candidate for consolidation under the CIM program. Therefore, the Committee recommends the deletion of the $6,500,000 requested for this program in fiscal year 1991. DLA is directed to submit future funding requests for materiel management automated systems to the OSD CIM program for coordination and review.

*Engineering data management information and control system.*—Fiscal year 1991 funds, $13,275,000, for the DLA portion of this Navy-led project are transferred to the computer-aided acquisition and logistics support program, discussed below.

### COMPUTER-AIDED ACQUISITION AND LOGISTICS SUPPORT

DOD established the computer-aided acquisition and logistics support [CALS] program in 1985 as a DOD and industry strategy to transition from paper-intensive weapon system design, manufacture, and support processes to a highly automated and integrated mode of operation. CALS is an attempt to establish automation standards for the technical data used to acquire and support weapons systems.

The Committee is concerned that the Department is not approaching CALS as it is CIM—through the development of DOD-wide technical data standards. Each of the services is pursuing different efforts, at various stages of development or deployment. Because this effort to standardize technical data automation standards shows great promise for managing complex weapons systems through their life cycles, the Committee believes this development effort should be continued with an emphasis on development of standard CALS systems.

The Committee fully supports the CALS initiative and encourages the Department to proceed with its efforts to standardize technical data. As discussed in the CIM section, the Committee believes that centralized management is the most effective method of achieving the standardization of DOD-wide technical data systems. Accordingly, the Committee recommends that CALS program responsibility and oversight be moved from the services to the OASD (production and logistics) CALS program office.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense requested $95,000,000 in fiscal year 1991 to accelerate Navy initiatives to improve the development, maintenance, and dissemination of logistics, engineering, and design data.

The justification provided by OSD for these funds does not adequately support the request to accelerate these projects. Therefore, before obligating any appropriated funds for CALS projects or systems, OSD is directed to review Army, Navy, Air Force, and defense agency CALS programs to determine which projects and systems will be selected as CALS standards. The Committee also directs OSD to notify the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services of the results of the review, and provide the Committees with a revised acquisition plan for CALS, and a plan for the termination of duplicative CALS programs.

In addition, the Committee directs the services to submit future budget requests for CALS-related systems or new start CALS programs through the OSD/CALS coordinator.

To assist the Department in the CALS effort, the Committee has taken the following actions:

—Appropriated $1,000,000,000 to the Secretary of Defense for the modernization and expansion of automated data processing systems. This recommendation is a reduction of $374,961,000 from the budget request of the services and defense agencies for fiscal year 1991.

—Transferred from the services and defense agencies to the OSD/CIM program in procurement, defense agencies the funds requested for CALS-related systems as follows:

*Procurement, defense agencies*

| *Item* | *Thousands* |
|---|---|
| Army: Digital storage and retrieval engineering data system | +$2,810 |
| Navy: Navy standard technical information system | +2,734 |
| Defense Logistics Agency: Engineering data management information and control system | +13,275 |
| Total | +18,819 |

### PUBLIC/PRIVATE COMPETITION

The Committee continues to strongly support the Navy initiative to compete workload between public facilities and the private sector. Competition will continue to provide the most effective means of ensuring the lowest cost for goods and services. The Committee encourages the Department to consider a wider application of this initiative in the continuing defense management review. To that end, the Committee has continued the authority provided to the Secretary to compete alteration, overhaul, and repair of Navy ships between public and private shipyards. In addition, the Committee has expanded the authority of the Secretary by allowing the Department to compete acquisition of production, modification, depot maintenance and repair of aircraft, vehicles, vessels, components and other defense-related articles between defense depot maintenance activities and private firms.

The Committee recognizes the ongoing need to maintain critical skills at these important industrial activities. Expanding competition can result in reduced training costs, enhanced critical skill levels, and maximized cost-effective utilization of these facilities.

### COAST GUARD TRANSFER

The Committee has included language in the bill providing for transfer of $300,000,000 in funding and in-kind support to the Coast Guard for support of the national defense responsibilities assigned to the agency. As a result of a memorandum of agreement with the Chief of Naval Operations, the Coast Guard is the lead agency tasked with maintaining the Nation's maritime defense zones [MDZ's]. MDZ readiness is responsive to guidance and requirements contained in the joint strategic capabilities plan, as published by the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff [JCS]; to the Navy capabilities mobilization plan, and other unified and specified commander's [ClNC's] operations plans. As a result of its expansion into the MDZ mission, the Coast Guard's readiness planning system has been revised to conform with the joint operations planning and execution system. The Coast Guard has also been required to increase its participation in JCS command post exercises and field training exercises. Coast Guard cutters are currently tasked in several ClNCLANT and ClNCPAC global and regional contingency plans. Currently, Coast Guard personnel, including reservists called to active duty, are participating in Operation Desert Shield.

The Coast Guard is also critically involved in the Nation's defense through its drug interdiction activities. Over and above its own sea and air interdiction efforts, the Coast Guard regularly deploys law enforcement detachment personnel aboard Navy vessels conducting drug interdiction patrols. Testimony to the Committee in support of the fiscal year 1991 budget request for drug interdiction and counterdrug activities identified the Coast Guard as the fifth military service in this effort. As the Department of Defense continues to increase counterdrug efforts, integration with Coast Guard commands will increase.

## HANDLING OF POTENTIALLY RECYCLABLE WASTES/MATERIALS BY DRMO

The Defense Reutilization and Materials Organization [DRMO] disposes of most hazardous wastes and surplus hazardous materials generated by military installations. Base commanders have the option of using either DRMO or their own contracting resources to dispose of hazardous wastes. However, if waste has recycled value and is saleable, commanders have no option other than to transfer them to DRMO.

The DRMO's reutilization, transfer, donation, and sale system [RTD&S] is sometimes administratively and sometimes geographically too far removed from site specific conditions to allow optimum management of recyclable hazardous waste and material. The Committee believes that too much recyclable hazardous waste/material may be summarily disposed of as hazardous waste and too many DRMO handled sales and donations may result in illegal storage and disposal incidents that tangle the generating command, DRMO, and the regulatory community in complicated cleanup and removal actions.

The Committee directs the Department of Defense to fund a study of hazardous waste minimization efforts to define the true costs associated with the current method of disposal through DRMO. Such costs must include those associated with improper handling of hazardous wastes from the RTD&S cycle. The Department should also undertake a trial program in fiscal year 1991 in which select commands manage hazardous waste/excess hazardous material recycling programs. A report should be provided to the Committee no later than April 15, 1991, on its findings.

## ENERGY CONSERVATION

The Committee provides a new general provision directing the Department of Defense to develop new energy conservation guidelines. The Committee believes that the conservation and wise use of energy resources is critical to U.S. national security. Over the past decade, however, the investment by the Department of Defense in energy conservation has declined from over $225,000,000 in

1981 to less than $2,000,000 this fiscal year according to testimony of the Department to Congress this July. The guidelines developed by the Secretary should include such items as the routine replacement of conventional light bulbs with high efficiency bulbs as a part of routine operation and maintenance activities. Furthermore, these guidelines should require that a justification be prepared when an energy conservation measure is not selected as part of operations and maintenance activities. The Department of Defense is the largest consumer of energy of any branch of the Federal Government. The total value of energy purchased by the Federal Government last year totaled $8,500,000,000, 80 percent of which was used by DOD. These costs will increase substantially in the coming year if current price trends continue.

### LEGACY RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

The Department of Defense controls nearly 25 million acres of land, nearly one-third the number of acres managed by the National Park Service or an area the size of Kentucky. Within this area is contained some of our Nation's most valuable natural and historical resources. The Committee believes that this situation places a special responsibility on the Department to serve not only as the defender of our national security, but as a thoughtful steward of our national heritage.

*Responsibility of stewardship.*—Last year the Secretary of Defense pledged the Department to serve as a steward of the environment and recognized this responsibility as integral to its primary mission. In an October 19, 1989, memorandum for secretaries of the military departments he stated:

> This administration wants the United States to be the world leader in addressing environmental problems and I want the Department of Defense to be the Federal leader in agency environmental compliance and protection * * *. The universal recognition of effective DOD environmental compliance and stewardship activities is the surest way to maintain our access to the air, land, and water we need to maintain and improve our mission capability.

Today, the Department of Defense is the custodian for some of the most pristine wild areas in the Nation. Its lands contain a wealth of plants and animals, including many on the Federal endangered species list, as well as historical sites representing the cultural and spiritual patrimony of the native American community. It is this precious legacy which the Committee is committed to preserving, in partnership with the military services, and on behalf of future generations of Americans.

*Establishment.*—This year, the Committee funds the establishment of the Legacy Resource Management Program [LRMP] under the existing authority of the Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Environment. The purpose of this program, also to be known as the Legacy Program, is to promote, manage, research, conserve, and restore, the priceless biological, geophysical, and historical resources which exist on public lands, facilities, or property held by the Department of Defense.

The Committee expects the Department of Defense to fund the LRMP as a separate line item within OSD and to report on its funding and program strategy in its annual budget justification document.

While the Legacy Program will concentrate principally on in-situ preservation efforts, its mandate also will cover off-site preservation where deemed appropriate.

The Legacy Resource Management Program is intended to complement the Defense Environmental Restoration Program [DERA] which funds the cleanup of hazardous waste sites, and the proposed Strategic Environmental Research Program which is intended to harness the scientific and technical expertise of DOD and Department of Energy laboratories for environmental protection. As such, it is a fully authorized undertaking falling within the legislative mandate of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Environment.

The Legacy Program complements these programs by preserving valuable natural habitat and historical sites from neglect and wanton destruction. In doing so, the LRMP initiative fills a critical gap in DOD programs addressing the environment. It also seeks to broaden our national appreciation for such resources by making them available to the public for their study and enjoyment.

The Committee expects that the program's initiatives will be applied broadly and consistently across the whole range of DOD lands, activities, services, agencies, and facilities.

*Administration.*—The Legacy Resource Management Program will be administered by the Director for Environmental Planning serving immediately under the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Environment [DASDE]. Headquarters and field staff required for the execution of the program will be determined by the DASDE.

*Legacy Resource Management Program initiatives.*—The Committee expects the LRMP to work cooperatively with qualified Federal, State, and private entities to identify, protect, and manage important biological, geophysical, and historical resources on Department of Defense lands. The Department should immediately initiate appropriate actions to develop resource management plans for lands under its control. These actions would:

—Establish a strategy, plan, and priority list for identifying and managing all biological, geophysical, and historical resources existing or involving on DOD lands, facilities, or property. This program shall provide for the stewardship of air, land, and water resources. A special effort will be made to protect unique species as well as those contained on the Federal endangered list and those which are candidates for that list.

—Establish a standard DOD methodology for the collection, storage, and retrieval of all biological, geophysical, and historical resource information. The inventory system developed for biological resources should be compatible with that used by State natural heritage programs.

—Establish programs to protect, inventory, conserve, and restore the artifacts of native American civilization, settler communities, and others deemed to have historical, cultural, or spiritual significance.

—Establish inventories of all scientifically significant biological, geophysical, and historical assets on DOD lands. In addition to the specific attributes of the asset, these inventories are to catalog their scientific and/or cultural significance, as well as their interrelationship to the surrounding environment, including the military mission carried out on the land upon which they reside.

—Establish programs for the restoration and rehabilitation of altered or degraded habitats.

—Establish educational, public access, and recreation programs designed to increase public appreciation, awareness, and support for these national environmental initiatives.

*Definition.*—The Committee expects the Department of Defense to adopt a standard, comprehensive, DOD-wide definition for the word "environment." References to the environment, and actions taken on behalf of the environment, shall encompass the entire range of activities, both re-active and pro-active, involving the protection, conservation, remediation, restoration, research, and inventory of sites relating to man and the biosphere. The definition would recognize the interrelationship of man and the natural world as well as the biological, geophysical, historical, and cultural ties which connect him to the land, air, and water.

*Base closures, realignment, and land acquisitions.*—The Committee expects the LRMP to give priority consideration to lands upon which U.S. military bases, installations, and facilities are proposed for closure, realignment, and acquisition in the coming years. Environmental impact analyses conducted by the Department of Defense should comprehensively address all the elements of the legacy resource management agenda and their soil, water, and air components.

Recommendations should be made by LRMP to the Secretary of Defense regarding the transfer of these lands to another land management agency with a broad resource protection mandate. The LRMP is to report its recommendations to the Committee, complete with appropriate environmental documentation, at least 6 months in advance of any base closure, realignment, transfer, or acquisition decisions.

The Committee intends that funds provided under the Base Closures Act may be used for environmental impact analyses conducted in connection with any base closure, realignment, or transfer activity.

*Training and personnel.*—The Committee expects that an environmental training program will be established, or an existing program utilized, as part of the LRMP. Its purpose would be to cultivate the leadership, sensitivity, scientific, and technical skills necessary to carry out the mandate of the Legacy Program. In the view of the Committee, this initiative is consistent with the Secretary of Defense's directive on environmental management policy: "the effort begins and ends with our people. We need the right people at the right place with the right training."

The Committee commends the Secretary of Defense and expects that he will issue appropriate personnel exemptions so that the staffing needs of the new LRMP program can be met.

*Cooperation.*—The Committee is aware that there exist nongovernmental organizations, as well as State and Federal agencies, which are dedicated to both the in-situ and ex-situ advancement and stewardship of biological, geophysical, and historical preservation. These entities routinely apply their technical expertise to resources management initiatives across the Nation and may be of considerable assistance to the Department of Defense in carrying out its mandate under the Legacy Program.

The Committee expects the Department to explore the potential for cooperative arrangements with both public and private groups and programs outside of DOD, and where possible, to work cooperatively in the development and execution of biological, geophysical, and historical resource management initiatives.

*Technology and personnel.*—The Committee believes that the Department of Defense has unique capabilities and resources, such as remote sensing technologies, laboratories, and personnel that can contribute to both in-situ and ex-situ biological and historical resource identification, management, conservation, and restoration.

Consistent with the efforts contemplated for the Strategic Environmental Research Program, the Committee expects that the Secretary of Defense, through the Legacy Program, will explore which scientific and technological capabilities held by the military might be used or adapted to the work of the Legacy Program.

The Committee also expects the Secretary of Defense to utilize departmental manpower and training resources, whenever possible, to combine the objectives and requirements of the Legacy Program with the Department's primary military mission.

The Committee supports efforts by the Department of Defense to develop a geographical information system [GIS] for use as a central data base for the inventory of biological, geophysical, and historical resources. All data gathered under LRMP will be available to the public unless the Secretary of Defense makes a determination that specific information be withheld for purposes of national security.

*Existing arrangements.*—The Committee is aware that the Department of Defense has concluded arrangements or agreements with groups, organizations, and entities to identify, document, and maintain biological diversity on defense installations. The Committee supports these initiatives as an element within the LRMP and expects that the arrangements or agreements previously agreed to will be continued.

*Reporting requirements.*—The Committee expects that the Secretary of Defense will report to the Committee no later than May 1, 1991, and September 1, 1991, on measures to establish and implement the Legacy Resource Management Program, the implementation of biological, geophysical, and historical resource management plans, its proposed administrative organization and its funding priorities for fiscal year 1991 and fiscal year 1992.

The reports should also include a progress statement on the establishment of an environmental training program, the potential for cooperative ventures with non-DOD groups as well as agencies of Federal and State government, and technology initiatives contemplated for legacy including GIS and a data retrieval and inventory system for historical resources.

### OPERATION SMILE

*Operation Smile.*—The Committee acknowledges the successful missions of Operation Smile International, a volunteer medical corps, providing surgical training and health care services in developing countries. Largely devoted to conducting reconstructive surgeries, training local medical professionals in specialized techniques, and providing followup health care services, Operation Smile continues to broaden its base of private and volunteer support from doctors and donors of supplies and equipment. The Committee encourages the expansion of the work of Operation Smile in aiding indigent children and families in the developing world.

In its support for the expanded role of the military in nation-building activities, including sharing of medical care services, capabilities, and resources, the Committee urges the Office of Humanitarian Assistance of the Department of Defense to coordinate with the Department of State to provide Operation Smile with excess property for its missions and to assist in making arrangements for its transportation.

## HEALTH AND MEDICAL ISSUES

### CIVILIAN HEALTH AND MEDICAL PROGRAM OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

*Alternate use of CHAMPUS funds.*—Since fiscal year 1989, the Congress has allowed each of the services to use up to $50,000,000 of funding provided for CHAMPUS claims for projects designed to produce more cost-effective medical care. (Catchment area demonstration projects are excluded.) The Committee continues to believe that this alternative is beneficial and supports the continuation of the use of $50,000,000 per service of CHAMPUS earmarked funds to increase health care services in military treatment facilities under the same development and management guidance provided during fiscal year 1989.

*CHAMPUS pricing reform.*—The Committee has revised the general provision contained in the Fiscal Year 1990 Defense Appropriations Act (section 9016), governing payment of physician and other individual health-care provider fees under CHAMPUS. This provision allows DOD to adopt payment reforms similar to several of those Congress enacted last year for Medicare. Most important is needed authority to reduce payments for services now significantly overpriced, based on current Medicare levels and the new levels being set by Medicare's Physician Payment Review Commission. The CHAMPUS physician payment bill, now approximately $1,000,000,000, is the fastest growing component of the spiraling CHAMPUS budget. CHAMPUS allowable payment levels currently average about 43 percent above Medicare's, highlighting the need for reform. Under the Committee's provision, DOD would analyze CHAMPUS allowable payment levels for all procedures in all locations. For services, including many primary care procedures, for which increases are appropriate, DOD will increase the allowable amount by the Medicare Economic Index, which DOD has used for each of the last 2 years. For services currently significantly overpriced based on the Medicare analysis, payment levels may be reduced by not more than 15 percent (the same reduction Congress adopted for Medicare overpriced procedures). For all others, the 1990 payment levels will continue into 1991. The Committee believes that this modest step, which should save 5 to 10 percent of CHAMPUS physician payment costs, is a necessary and appropriate one.

*Expansion of CHAMPUS reform initiative [CRI].*—While the Committee is encouraged by progress made by the Department of Defense and Foundation Health Corp. in overcoming some of the initial problems encountered in the CHAMPUS reform initiative, the Committee is still concerned about continuing administrative problems. The Rand Corp., in its report on CRI, found that CRI has achieved savings through its managed care programs, but Rand's findings were based on only 3 months' data. The Committee is reluctant to agree to expansion of CRI at the present time and directs the Department of Defense to continue to monitor the programs in California and Hawaii and not to expand CRI to other States in fiscal year 1991.

*CHAMPUS funding.*—The Committee recommends appropriations for CHAMPUS and OCHAMPUS, as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Army | $958,900,000 |
| Navy | 880,500,000 |
| Air Force | 923,600,000 |
| Total | 2,763,000,000 |
| OCHAMPUS | 50,293,000 |

*CHAMPUS deductibles.*—Although civilian and other Federal insurance programs have increased deductibles paid by beneficiaries of their insurance plans over the past several years, the deductibles ($50 per individual and $100 per family) paid by CHAMPUS beneficiaries since the program began in 1966 have never been increased. CHAMPUS costs are increasing at an unacceptable rate, while the program remains one of the most generous health insurance programs in this country. The Committee has included a general provision (section 8057) which would increase CHAMPUS deductibles to $150 per individual and $300 per family, with the exception of dependents of active duty military personnel in grades E-1 to E-4.

The Committee has also given the Department of Defense authority to change CHAMPUS deductibles and to place restrictions on availability of care (except for emergencies) if beneficiaries decline enrollment where managed-care programs are in existence.

*Mental health care.*—In recent years, CHAMPUS mental health costs have increased faster than other elements of the benefit package. Mental health costs more than doubled between 1986 and 1989 from $303,000,000 to $633,000,000. In 1989, mental health care represented about 25 percent of the total CHAMPUS program costs. In contrast, private sector firms' average mental health cost was about 11 percent of total costs. Mental health costs in the Blue Cross/Blue Shield Federal employee plan, which originally served as a model for CHAMPUS, represented about 4 percent of total costs.

CHAMPUS mental health benefits are more generous than plans available to Federal or private sector employees. Federal and private sector plans: (1) impose dollar or day limits on the amount of care provided annually, per benefit period, or lifetime; and (2) apply greater cost-sharing burdens on the enrollees in the form of deductibles, coinsurance, and out-of-pocket limits. These cost-sharing provisions and limits are generally applied separately from other illnesses.

Federal and private sector plans tend to limit inpatient care to 30 days per year and outpatient care to 30 or 50 visits per year. A $1,000 per year cap is usually applied to outpatient services. CHAMPUS allows 60 days of inpatient care and unlimited inpatient days for children in residential treatment centers. CHAMPUS also allows 2 outpatient visits a week, or 104 such visits per 365-day period, and does not impose a dollar cap. For active duty dependents, CHAMPUS pays 100 percent of inpatient room and board charges compared to the 80 percent common in other plans, and 80 percent of outpatient charges compared to 50 percent of charges paid by Federal and private plans. Federal plans impose annual mental health deductibles of $500 to $750 per person and limit lifetime benefits to about $50,000 per person. CHAMPUS does not have either of these cost-sharing requirements.

The Committee feels that the time has come to address the ever-increasing cost of mental health care provided under CHAMPUS and has included a general provision (section 8038) which establishes certain limitations with respect to mental health care. The Committee's provision would reduce the inpatient mental health care annual limit from 60 to 30 days, with follow-on case management when this limit is reached. The introduction of case management when the limit is reached will allow the Department to ensure better quality health care and appropriate utilization of mental health services. In addition, the Committee's provision would require preauthorization for all nonemergency inpatient admissions and authorization within 48 hours for all emergency admissions. Admission decisions should be made by mental health care providers with no economic relationship with the facility to which the patient is admitted.

The provision would also establish a limit of 90 days per calendar year for residential treatment center care, with follow-on care to be determined by case management. To assure that admission to a residential treatment center is appropriate, the decision to admit a patient to such a center should be made by a mental health care provider with no economic relationship with the center. Waiver of the 90-day limit would be permitted under extraordinary circumstances.

*Mental health care in MTF's.*—The Committee believes that it is possible further to reduce the costs of CHAMPUS mental health care by increasing the care provided in military medical treatment facilities [MTF's]. By increased allocation of personnel and resources to MTF's in areas where there is heavy use of CHAMPUS inpatient mental health dollars, both patients and CHAMPUS could benefit. The Committee asks the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs to work with the Surgeons General of the Army, Navy, and Air Force to investigate the possibility and benefits of allocating additional personnel and resources to inpatient high-use areas. The Committee also asks that the Secretary and the Surgeons General consider the establishment of crisis intervention teams at all major MTF's. It continues to believe that coordination of mental health care is the best method of providing quality mental health care while, at the same time, containing costs.

*Mammograms.*—The Senate-passed authorization bill and the authorization bill reported by the House Armed Services Committee contain identical provisions allowing CHAMPUS to pay for pap smears and mammograms. The Committee feels that this is a benefit long overdue. For both of these procedures, the Committee urges the Department of Defense to adopt the guidelines of the American Cancer Society.

*Hawaii State taxes/CHAMPUS reform initiative.*—For 2 years the Defense Appropriations Act has carried a provision that funds derived from contracts or subcontracts issued for the CHAMPUS reform initiative shall not be subject to Hawaii State and local taxes. The Committee has deleted this provision. The Committee directs the Department of Defense to work with Queens Medical Center [QMC] in Hawaii to assure that these costs are appropriately recognized in the QMC contract as a cost of doing business.

## NONPHYSICIAN HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS

*Federal nursing school.*—In the conference report on the Fiscal Year 1990 Defense Appropriations Act, the conferees directed the Department of Defense to develop a feasibility/implementation plan for a Federal nursing school. The conferees expressed their concern over the nursing shortage in this country in both the civilian and military communities and further expressed their opinion that a Federal nursing school might be a cost-effective means of producing an increased population of nurses, not only for the Department of Defense, but also for other Federal agencies employing nurses, such as the Veterans Administration and the Public Health Service.

The Department of Defense appointed a task force in November 1989 to study the feasibility and cost of establishing a College of Nursing within the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences.

If DOD decides, as a result of the ongoing feasibility study, to pursue an in-house Federal nursing school, the Committee directs that an analysis be undertaken comparing the cost of a DOD-owned and operated facility with that of a nonfederally owned and operated institution. In that regard, a methodology similar to that required by Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76 should be used. This would entail conducting a cost comparison study to include development of a performance statement of work, an in-house cost estimate and formal solicitation of bids from the private sector for comparison with the in-house cost estimate. The Committee directs that a decision on the need for and location of a Federal nursing school shall be based on cost effectiveness, as well as the potential benefits to the Federal Government.

*Separate departments of psychology, optometry, and social work.*—The Committee continues to be concerned that the Army, Navy, and Air Force are not proceeding expeditiously enough to establish separate departments of psychology, optometry, and social work at major military health care centers. It is pleased to note that, where administratively separate services of optometry, for example, have been established, they are working well. The Committee encourages the continuation of the separate services concept with a view toward making it universal for all military health care treatment facilities.

*Postdoctoral psychology programs consolidation.*—The Committee believes that consolidation by the individual services of postdoctoral psychology training programs into a few major medical centers would be beneficial. The Committee, therefore, directs the services to present to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate, no later than June 1, 1991, a plan for such consolidations. The Committee notes that Tripler Army Medical Center in Hawaii is uniquely qualified to administer a consolidated program for the Army. The Committee is certain that the other services have similarly qualified medical centers and directs that all three services include in their report the proposed locations of consolidated postdoctoral psychology training programs.

*Pay bonuses.*—Over the past several years, the Congress has provided authority to pay some nonphysician health care providers special and incentive pays to improve recruiting and retention. An effort is being made this year through the authorization process to provide authority for incentive pay for certified nurse-midwives and intensive care nurses, increased special pay for optometrists and new authority to provide special pay for podiatrists. The Committee believes that there is a matter of equity involved and wishes to make clear its intention that all properly authorized bonuses or special or incentive pays for nonphysician health care providers shall, in fact, be paid.

*Promotion policies.*—Nonphysician health care providers have traditionally been at a disadvantage in their access to promotion opportunities, even though many of these nonphysician specialties are in short supply and retention patterns are down. With a continuing shortage of military physicians—a shortage that is unlikely to disappear in the foreseeable future—the nonphysician disciplines play a vital and necessary role in providing quality health care to military members, their dependents and retirees. The Committee believes that it is time to take a hard look at promotion policies affecting the nonphysician disciplines. To this end, the Committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs [ASD[HA]] to appoint a panel of representatives of the OASD[HA], the three Surgeons General, and representatives of the professional associations of the various nonphysician disciplines (such as the American Optometric Association, the American Nursing Association and the American Podiatric Medical Association) to examine the question of assuring that there is equity in the number and rank of promotions for nonphysicians in comparison with physicians. The Committee understands that some of the inequity is caused by DOPMA regulations and expects the panel to consider and recommend changes in DOPMA necessary to correct this problem. The Committee also asks that the panel examine policies of the military services, separate from DOPMA, which contribute to inequities in the promotion system. The Committee will expect a report to be made to the House of Representatives and Senate Appropriations Committees no later than June 1, 1991.

*Clinical psychology program.*—The Committee has included $280,000 for the establishment of a clinical psychology program at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences [USUHS]. These funds will provide developmental support, including the hiring of new faculty, support staff, and curriculum planning. It is expected that the projected 4-year program will eventually support 36 students annually, including those from the U.S. Public Health Service. Students trained are expected to incur obligated service identical to that of current USUHS medical officers.

### STRESS INTERVENTION

The Committee is concerned that military members and their families may not be adequately served in the management of stress caused by the current volatility and uncertainty in the military services. The Committee urges the Department of Defense to institute interdisciplinary efforts for stress intervention and management, particularly targeted to military members and their families who are being involuntarily separated from the military services and to families of military members engaged in operations near the Persian Gulf.

### PEDIATRIC-EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES

In fiscal year 1990, $300,000 was appropriated to the Office of the Secretary of Defense to be used for a comprehensive review and development of a preliminary training program to improve pediatric-emergency medical services. The study is ongoing and has not been completed. The Committee feels that the training program being developed through this study will be of benefit not only to military dependent children but to children of civilians as well and has again appropriated $300,000 for fiscal year 1991 to allow completion of the study and training program.

### HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE

The Committee has continued a provision contained in the fiscal year 1990 appropriations bill (section 8020) to allow Tripler Army Medical Center to treat no more than 250 selected patients from the Pacific territories and the former Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands on a nonreimbursable basis during fiscal year 1991 and to pay their transportation costs. In fiscal year 1990, the Congress appropriated $500,000 for these transportation costs, and the Committee is delighted that the Army's budget request contains funding to continue the program in fiscal year 1991.

### NURSES PERFORMING NONCLINICAL TASKS

In fiscal year 1990, the Congress appropriated $20,000,000 to the Army to be used for additional medical support staff and earmarked $1,600,000 for a demonstration program at Tripler Army Medical Center to test the idea that dollars spent on additional ancillary personnel will improve nurse productivity and satisfaction. In part because of the civilian hiring freeze, this demonstration program got off to a late start. The Army has included $20,000,000 in its fiscal year 1991 budget for additional medical support staff, and the Committee is directing the Army to use $1,700,000 of these funds to continue the demonstration program at Tripler.

### VA AND DOD CIVILIAN PAY COMPARABILITY

The Committee has included a general provision (section 8074) which would authorize the Secretary of Defense to make applicable to Department of Defense employees in positions involving health care responsibilities the provisions of chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, concerning employees in the Department of Veterans Affairs. This authority is vitally needed to overcome persistent problems experienced by the military services in filling civilian positions for difficult-to-hire health care occupations in many locales. The proposed legislation would enhance DOD initiatives to recapture CHAMPUS workload into the less expensive direct care system. Recapture of CHAMPUS workload requires improved access to the direct care system, and adequate staffing of civilian medical and medical support personnel is essential to accessibility of care in military medical treatment facilities. In addition, numerous studies have shown that the longstanding lack of adequate medical support personnel is a primary reason for dissatisfaction and declining retention of military health care providers.

### NATIONAL MUSEUM OF HEALTH AND MEDICINE

The National Museum of Health and Medicine, administered by the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology, was moved off The Mall to a site at Walter Reed Army Medical Center in 1968. Since that time visitation has declined substantially, and the museum has had inadequate funding to maintain its facility. Recognizing the importance of health education, the Committee is pleased that efforts are currently underway to revitalize the museum. A foundation of distinguished individuals has begun the process of raising funds for the construction and operation of a new museum facility.

In conjunction with the search for a better museum facility, there is growing interest in moving the museum under a more appropriate component of our Federal Government, such as the Public Health Service or the National Institutes of Health. The Committee directs the Department of Defense to work cooperatively with those agencies in establishing a new museum facility and determining if it would be more appropriate to have the museum as a component of the Department of Health and Human Services.

### INCREASED AUTHORITY TO COLLECT FROM PRIVATE INSURANCE

Section 8068, a new general provision, would allow the Department of Defense to collect from Medicare supplemental insurance policy carriers and from automobile liability and no-fault insurance carriers for treatment of eligible patients in military hospitals. As an incentive for the military hospitals to make these collections, net proceeds would remain at the collecting medical facility.

## OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $22,787,559,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 23,562,900,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 21,664,190,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $21,664,190,000. This is $1,898,710,000 below the budget estimate.

### SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

Committee adjustments to the budget estimate are summarized in the following table:

[In thousands of dollars]

| *Program* | *Committee adjustments* |
|---|---|
| Fiscal year 1991 budget request | 23,562,900 |
| General purpose forces: | |
| Office automation | −12,000 |
| Maintenance and logistic support | −68,196 |
| JCS exercises | −28,000 |
| Miscellaneous corrections | −6,180 |
| Intelligence and communications: | |
| European telephone enhancement | −23,564 |
| Command, control, and communications | −40,000 |
| Central supply and maintenance: Second destination transportation | −20,000 |
| Training, medical, and other general personnei activities: | |
| Training and education | −100,000 |
| Recruiting, advertising, and examining | −40,000 |
| Administration and associated activities: | |
| Claims | −10,000 |
| Reproduction and printing | −35,000 |
| Banking | −15,000 |
| Arroyo center | −23,400 |
| Civilian personnel freeze | −325,800 |
| Foreign national civilians | −125,100 |
| O&M general support to military personnel | −93,300 |
| Retire older systems | −15,000 |
| Real property maintenance | −350,000 |
| Base operations | −105,000 |
| Inventory management | −146,100 |
| Stock fund operations costs adjustment | 134,500 |
| Corporate information management | −542,070 |
| Currency fluctuation | 101,700 |
| Classified programs | −11,200 |
| Total | 21,664,190 |

### COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

*Office automation.*—The Committee recommends $12,000,000 requested for replacement of office automation workstations at European work centers be denied. The requested improvements should be deferred until the impact of force structure realignments and base closures in Europe has been determined.

*European telephone system.*—The budget includes $23,564,000 to improve the German telephone system by upgrading switches and cables. The Committee believes that these improvements should be deferred until the impact of force structure realignments and base closures in Europe has been determined. Accordingly, the Committee recommends that no funds be appropriated for this effort in fiscal year 1991.

*Maintenance and logistical support.*—The budget includes a 25-percent increase for maintenance and support of general purpose forces. This increase includes an additional $36,319,000 for unit level maintenance; that is, that performed in the field rather than at Army depots. The budget also includes an increase of $31,877,000 for storage of war reserves in Europe. The Committee recommends denying funding increases for these efforts in light of recent changes in Eastern Europe. Reduced force levels and the withdrawal of troops from Europe should lead to reduced funding for these efforts in fiscal year 1991.

*JCS exercises.*—The Committee supports the Department's recent decisions to reduce the number of training exercises being undertaken on European soil, and supports the requested 40-percent increase in funding for the combat maneuver training center at Hoenfels, Germany. It is concerned, however, with the increase in funding requested for Army participation in the Joint Chiefs of Staff [JCS] exercise program. Recent experience has shown that JCS exercises such as Reforger (return of forces to Germany) have been reduced since fiscal year 1989. The Committee recommends a reduction of $28,000,000 from the request of $105,496,000, continuing funding for Army participation in JCS exercises at the level experienced in fiscal year 1989.

*Claims.*—The budget includes a significant increase from fiscal year 1989 actual payments for damage claims resulting from participation in JCS exercises. The Army has noted that claims usually are paid 2 years after the exercise occurs. The Committee recommends a reduction of $10,000,000 from the $42,000,000 requested. This provides funding at 90 percent of the level actually realized in fiscal year 1989. This level will be sufficient due to the reduced number of JCS exercises undertaken in fiscal year 1989.

*Second destination transportation.*—Second destination transportation pays for any shipment of materiel after initial delivery by the contractor. The fiscal year 1991 budget includes an increase in funding for this effort in order to redistribute equipment from military units affected by force level reductions. The Army has also included funding to restore this equipment to fully capable status prior to redistribution. The Committee believes that the process of determining which equipment will be redistributed, performing the significant maintenance activities required before transportation is required, and gathering sufficient numbers for efficient transportation will cause the need for additional funding to occur in fiscal year 1992. Accordingly, the recommendation reduces funding by $20,000,000 to continue second destination transportation funding at the fiscal year 1990 level.

*Reproduction and printing.*—The Army request for printing and reproduction services in fiscal year 1991 is 89 percent above the fiscal year 1989 actual experience. It is similarly higher than the amounts requested by the Navy and Air Force. The Committee notes that although a reduction of $10,400,000 in Army printing was directed by Congress in fiscal year 1990, budget documentation indicates that the Army is planning to spend $10,000,000 more than had been requested; that is, $20,400,000 more than had been appropriated. The Committee recommends reducing Army funding for reproduction and printing by $35,000,000. The resulting funding is comparable to that actually experienced by the Army in fiscal year 1989 and is similar to the funding requested by the Navy and Air Force.

*Miscellaneous corrections.*—The Army requested $6,180,000 for general purpose forces under the title of "Miscellaneous Corrections" after review of teleconference and travel requirements. During review of the fiscal year 1990 budget Congress directed the Services to reduce travel based on the availability of video teleconferencing facilities. The requested increase directly contravenes the direction provided in fiscal year 1990. The Committee recommendation denies the requested funding.

*Arroyo center.*—The Committee recommends transferring $23,400,000 included in the "Operations and maintenance, Army," budget for this research and development center to the RDT&E, Army, appropriation where it is more correctly budgeted. Additional discussion is provided in the RDT&E section of the report.

*CINC's train.*—The Committee directs that no operation and maintenance funds be available to support continued operation of the commander in chief Europe's [CINCEUR] personal train. The existence of such a command asset may have been justified many years ago when travel to and from Berlin was difficult and expensive. However, considering that Germany has been unified and East-West tensions have significantly lessened, the continued existence of a special train for CINCEUR is unnecessary.

*Army depot facilities.*—With the reduction in conventional forces in Europe, the ability of the U.S. Army logistics system to process and store the material that will be returned for disposal or safe keeping will become more important. The Committee recommends that the Army supply depots continue to receive adequate funding to meet this requirement.

*Red River Army Depot.*—The Committee is concerned by recent actions taken by the Army to sharply curtail maintenance and supply activities at the Red River Army Depot [RRAD]. These cuts proportionally far exceed those programmed for other similar Army depots. While facility reductions will be required as we cut the size of our Armed Forces, the Department of Defense has so far not justified the disproportionate cuts at RRAD in terms of future force structure requirements, projected futures workload or operational efficiency.

RRAD is well located in the south-central part of the country near excellent rail, highway, and river arteries, and is one of the Army's most efficient and cost-effective depots. Congress has appropriated funds for construction of an automated supply distribution facility which will greatly expand the depot's supply capacity. The Committee believes RRAD could be a major hub in the consolidation of supply activities under the Defense Logistics Agency. In addition, the depot has a new consolidated maintenance facility which is operating at only 40 percent of capacity. Because of these capabilities, RRAD could be an excellent site for expanded maintenance responsibilities, particularly if the Department decides to consolidate the depot maintenance activities of the military services.

It would be a mistake to disproportionately reduce operations at RRAD before the Department of Defense has determined the depot structure required to support future supply and maintenance requirements. The Committee therefore directs that the Army not reduce onboard civilian manpower below the authorization for October 1, 1990, by a percentage greater than the average of such cuts at other major Army supply and maintenance depots in the United States without the specific approval of the Secretary of Defense and notification of the congressional oversight committees.

*School of the Americas.*—The Committee wants to express its interest in assuring that the School of the Americas at Fort Benning, GA, receives adequate funding in fiscal year 1991. The Committee has recommended fully funding the budget request for fiscal year 1991 and urges the Department of the Army to provide additional funding, if the school can justify the need for such additional funds.

*Extended cold weather clothing system.*—The Committee is pleased to note that the Army has included funding in the budget for continued acquisition of the extended cold weather clothing system [ECWCS]. In recognition of the Army's intent to continue this program, the Committee has not repeated bill language requiring that funds within the operation and maintenance appropriation be included for ECWCS. The Committee does direct, however, that the entire $39,951,000 requested for ECWCS must be used on this program and that none of the reductions to the fiscal year 1991 operation and maintenance, Army, appropriation resulting from congressional action may be applied to ECWCS acquisition.

*Watertown International Airport.*—The Committee requests the Secretary of the Army to evaluate advantages and disadvantages of designating an expanded Watertown International Airport as the point of embarkation for some or all of the 10th Mountain Division at Fort Drum, either during the winter months or year-round. In cooperation with airport officials, the Secretary should report on the costs and benefits of this proposal, including compensation to the airport for basing military transport aircraft at the Watertown facility. The Secretary shall report back to the Committee within 9 months of passage of this act.

## OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $23,863,121,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 24,531,600,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 23,230,691,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $23,230,691,000. This is $1,300,909,000 below the budget estimate.

### SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

Committee adjustments to the budget estimate are summarized in the following table:

[In thousands of dollars]

| Program | Committee adjustments |
|---|---|
| Fiscal year 1991 budget request | 24,531,600 |
| General purpose forces: | |
| Excess voyage repairs | −32,300 |
| Hydrofoil patrol boats [PHM] | −18,000 |
| Intelligence and communications: | |
| Leased communications | −19,836 |
| Command, control, and communications | −30,000 |

| *Program* | *adjustments* |
|---|---|
| Central supply and maintenance: | |
| Air-launched weapons maintenance backlog | −15,384 |
| Other aviation systems maintenance | −36,100 |
| Transportation | −25,000 |
| Training, medical, and other general personnel activities: | |
| Training and education | −100,000 |
| Recruiting, advertising, and examining | −11,500 |
| Administration and associated activities: Banking | −7,000 |
| Civilian personnel freeze | −285,600 |
| Foreign national civilians | −45,900 |
| O&M general support to military personnel | −65,200 |
| Retire older systems | −40,000 |
| Increased use of Reserves | −49,000 |
| Real property maintenance | −100,000 |
| Base operations | −22,400 |
| Inventory management | −202,000 |
| Stock fund operations costs adjustment | 22,300 |
| Corporate information management | −283,373 |
| Currency fluctuation | 75,300 |
| Classified programs | −5,916 |
| Total | 23,230,691 |

## COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

*Excess voyage repairs.*—The Committee recommends that $32,300,000 requested for voyage repair funding that is excess to requirements be denied. The Navy requests funding to repair voyage damage based on the number of operating months projected for the fiscal year. The Navy has overstated the number of months used to determine the amount of funding requested in the fiscal year 1991 budget for this effort. Based on a reduced estimate of ship operating months derived from the projected number of operating years available from the ship inventory for fiscal year 1991, there will be 10 percent fewer repairs required. The Committee recommendation adjusts the budget to reflect this lower number.

*Air-launched weapons maintenance backlog.*—The budget includes a 30-percent increase in funding for rework of air launched weapons. In a time of greater fiscal constraints, reduction of the maintenance backlog must receive a lower priority. The Committee recommends a reduction of $15,384,000 which allows the rework to continue at the same level as that planned for fiscal year 1990.

*Other aviation systems maintenance.*—The Navy has requested an increase of $50,600,000 (almost 25 percent) in fiscal year 1991 for maintenance of minor aviation systems. A major part of this increase provides for additional calibrations of test equipment ($10,400,000), software support ($10,200,000), and support equipment reworks ($15,500,000). No justification for these increases is provided. This increase in funding is inappropriate in a fiscally constrained environment. The Committee recommends a reduction of $36,100,000 which provides sufficient funds to continue this effort at the same level planned for fiscal year 1990.

*Hydrofoil patrol boats [PHM].*—The Navy budget includes $18,000,000 for operating PHM in the Caribbean area in support of drug interdiction efforts. The Committee recommends realigning support for PHM to the drug interdiction and counterdrug activities appropriation, reflecting the revised role of these vessels.

*Leased communications.*—The Navy requested an increase of $19,836,000 for nonsecure direct dialing services. These services are provided through the Defense Communications Agency [DCA] which bills the services for costs incurred. For fiscal year 1991 DCA revised the billing method to make costs user sensitive, intending that this would reduce the bill for these services. The Committee recommends continuing funding at the fiscal year 1990 level on the basis that this new billing system will in fact reduce costs as intended.

*Transportation.*—Beginning in fiscal year 1991, costs for initial transportation of goods from the manufacturer to the first destination are being paid from the procurement appropriations. Previously these costs were charged to the "Operations and maintenance" account. The Navy's operations and maintenance budget, however, does not reflect a reduction in transportation costs in the fiscal year 1991 budget submitted to Congress. The Committee recommends a reduction of $25,000,000 for transportation to reflect the reduced costs to this appropriation resulting from the revised budget policy.

*MHC homeporting.*—The Committee continues to support the Navy's decision to homeport coastal minehunters in Astoria, OR. The Committee is concerned, however, that the Navy has not yet selected a site in Astoria for homeporting these vessels. The Navy should work closely with State and local governments to resolve any outstanding issues in site selection so that the site will be ready by the time a homeport for these ships is required. The Committee is aware of the State's plans to develop South Tongue Point as a marine industrial site, possibly in conjunction with the Navy. The Navy is encouraged to seriously consider working with the State to implement a long-term lease for facilities at South Tongue Point. To that end, the Committee directs the Navy to provide a status report on MHC homeporting at Astoria no later than January 15, 1991.

*Nuclear submarine dismantling.*—The Navy currently has several submarines at the inactive facility at Puget Sound, WA, from which the reactor compartments have been removed. The Navy's final environmental impact statement (May 1984) indicated that 100 nuclear submarines would require disposal by the year 2000. Current improved relations among the major powers would indicate that nuclear submarines will be retired from active service at an even faster rate. There are also two nuclear submarine tenders at the inactive facility awaiting disposal.

Navy contractors currently have the industrial capacity to dismantle submarine and submarine tender hulls, and can arrange with other defense contractors to provide the technical support to undertake this work. In order to take full advantage of all potential disposal capabilities, the Navy is directed to develop a joint naval shipyard/industry study team to prepare a detailed plan and schedule for the dismantlement and disposal of the submarine and surface ship hulls which have had their reactor compartments removed. This plan should address the disposition of material, salvage of equipment and or components, and any hazardous waste generated by the dismantling process. The schedule should include key events which would allow the Committee to assess the Navy's progress in meeting reasonable hull disposal numbers annually. This study should be completed and provided to the Committee no later than May 1991.

*UNC naval products.*—For 30 years, UNC Naval Products Division in Uncasville, CT, has been a manufacturer of high-quality defense components for the Department of Energy. Specifically, this facility has produced approximately 160 propulsion units exclusively for the U.S. Government. In light of the recent procurement projections for the *Seawolf* class submarines, UNC's provision of propulsion components is being phased out.

While the decision to rely on a sole source strategy for naval nuclear components may have been the correct one under the circumstances, the wasting of the unique resources and industrial base offered by UNC is a question that demands consideration beyond the merits of the sole source decision.

The investment in UNC's physical infrastructure and human capital resources can and should be put to other uses in assisting the Nation in meeting both military and civilian project objectives. UNC has 1,000 highly trained, DOE cleared employees; it is a DOE/DOD secure facility with a NRC license. UNC's 500,000-square-foot facility can provide state-of-the-art engineering, manufacturing, and inspection facilities in full compliance with DOE, DOT, NRC, and EPA applicable requirements.

UNC has a rare capability to assist DOE in the management of the military nuclear programs and complexes as well as to assist in the provision of design and manufacturing services in controlled environments.

The Committee is concerned about the retaining of an adequate naval nuclear industrial base. Therefore, it urges DOE to evaluate additional work which can be placed with UNC naval products to maintain that facility, its NRC license and DOE cleared personnel within the Nation's nuclear industrial base.

*Environmental remedial investigation at Adak Naval Air Station.*—The Committee understands that the Navy has identified seven sites at the Adak Naval Air Station that pose a potential hazard to human health and the environment. The first step to restore these sites will be the completion of a remediation plan, approved by the Navy, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the State of Alaska.

The Committee understands that $3,900,000 has been requested for the completion of the remedial investigation of these seven sites at the Adak Naval Air Station. The Navy should expedite completion of these investigations. The Secretary of the Navy shall report the findings of these remedial investigations and the proposed restoration plan, not later than August 1, 1991.

*Navy facilities upgrade.*—The Committee recommends bill language to provide not less than $15,000,000 out of funds provided under this act for "Operation and maintenance, Navy", to support the upgrade of port facilities in Israel for United States Navy operations and maintenance activities. Activities supported by this appropriation shall include, but not be limited to, maintenance dredging, pier improvements, enhanced power generation, increased water desalination capability, POL storage improvements, improved drydocks, cranes, and specialized maintenance equipment.

The Committee strongly supports the use of port facilities in Haifa for the support, maintenance and repair of U.S. Navy ships and the rest and relaxation of Navy personnel. As such, the Committee expects the Navy to increase its use of the facilities at the port of Haifa to the greatest extent possible and consistent with U.S. Navy readiness requirements and cost effectiveness.

Furthermore, the Committee directs the Navy to examine the feasibility of using the port of Ashdod, Israel, for maintenance, repair, reprovisioning, rest and relaxation activities. The Navy is to report, no later than May 15, 1991, on its findings, to include: a plan and timetable for using Ashdod, the cost of upgrading or expanding existing facilities to accommodate Navy ships and personnel, and the contribution that access to Ashdod could make to the increased readiness and sustainability of U.S. military forces in the region.

## OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $1,657,719,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 1,948,100,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 1,880,100,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,880,100,000. This is $68,000,000 below the budget estimate.

### SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

Committee adjustments to the budget estimate are summarized in the following table:

[In thousands of dollars]

| *Program* | *Committee adjustments* |
|---|---|
| Fiscal year 1991 budget estimate | 1,948,100 |
| Civilian personnel freeze | −20,200 |
| O&M general support to military personnel | −11,100 |
| Base operations | −10,000 |
| Training and education | −3,500 |
| Recruiting, advertising, and examining | −8,000 |
| Inventory management | −15,200 |
| Total | 1,880,100 |

## OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $21,806,213,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 22,048,900,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 20,064,092,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $20,064,092,000. This is $1,984,808,000 below the budget estimate.

### SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

Committee adjustments to the budget estimate are summarized in the following table:

[In thousands of dollars]

| *Program* | *Committee adjustments* |
|---|---|
| Fiscal year 1991 budget estimate | 22,048,900 |
| Strategic forces: | |
| EC-130 Looking Glass | −11,900 |
| Minuteman II | −17,000 |

| Program | Committee adjustments |
|---|---|
| General purpose forces: | |
| USAF operational test and evaluation center [AFOTEC] | –1,109 |
| Defense department counternarcotics program funding for CINC initiatives | –16,092 |
| Flying hour costs | –6,922 |
| Morale, welfare, and recreation [MWR] | –15,000 |
| Dormitory furnishings | –18,736 |
| Chemical/Biological Defense Program | 3,422 |
| Intelligence and communications: | |
| Command, control, and communications | –65,532 |
| Milstar | –3,822 |
| Airlift: | |
| Dormitory furnishings | –3,317 |
| Purchased communications | –2,336 |
| Central supply and maintenance: | |
| Aircraft service extension program | –100,000 |
| Automated data processing [ADP], maintenance, service, equipment | –3,400 |
| Exchangeable component repair | –21,615 |
| Deferred requirements | –3,721 |
| C–17A interim contractor support [ICS] | –19,500 |
| Printing and reproduction | –15,000 |
| Audiovisual | –1,492 |
| Military airlift command [MAC] channel airlift | –18,501 |
| Commissary operations | –14,799 |
| Supplies and equipment | –11,853 |
| Training, medical, and other general personnel activities: | |
| Training and education | –90,000 |
| Recruiting, advertising, and examination | –17,000 |
| Administration and associated activities: | |
| Contractor support | –5,335 |
| Departmental supplies and equipment | –1,800 |
| Servicewide data processing services, supplies, other | –4,980 |
| Banking | –8,000 |
| Fiscal year 1990 civilian personnel freeze | –362,800 |
| O&M general support to military personnel | –80,000 |
| Foreign national civilians | –33,300 |
| Retire older systems | –45,000 |
| Increased use reserves | –67,000 |
| Real property maintenance | –150,000 |
| Base operations | –125,000 |
| Inventory management | –148,700 |
| Stock fund operations cost | –103,400 |
| Corporate information management | –427,182 |
| Currency fluctuation | 71,300 |
| Classified programs | –18,386 |
| Total | 20,064,092 |

## COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

*Telecommunications command and control programs.*—The Committee recommends a reduction of $11,900,000 in funding for the operation and maintenance of the EC–135 Looking Glass aircraft. This recommendation is consistent with the decision of the Strategic Air Command to scale back the flights of Looking Glass aircraft in response to reduced tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union.

*Minuteman II.*—The Committee recommends a reduction of $17,000,000 in the administration's request for Minuteman II operation and maintenance. A General Accounting Office [GAO] report [NSIAD–90–196BR] anticipates the Air Force could achieve these savings through the elimination of unnecessary depot repairs and modifications. Secretary Cheney has indicated that the Minuteman II force could be retired as a result of the START negotiations. As a result, the Committee believes that the continued upgrading of the Minuteman II is inappropriate at this time.

*Defense Department counter narcotics program funding for CINC initiatives.*—The Committee directs that the $16,092,000 budgeted to the Air Force for drug interdiction under the "CINC initiatives" account be transferred to the "Drug interdiction and counterdrug activities, Defense" account.

*USAF Operational Test and Evaluation Center [AFOTEC].*—The Committee recommends that the proposed $1,109,000 increase in contractor support for AFOTEC be denied. The request represents a 30-percent increase above inflation over fiscal year 1990 and can not be justified.

*Chemical/Biological Defense Program.*—The Committee recommends that full funding be restored for the Air Force Chemical and Biological Defense Program. The proposed reduction of $3,422,000 represents an 11-percent decrease below the fiscal year 1990 level which cannot be justified at this time.

*Flying hour costs.*—The Committee recommends that a reduction of $6,922,000 be made in the request for additional flying hours. The administration's request represents a 20-percent increase over the fiscal year 1990 level. The request is unnecessary in light of force structure reductions, increased command and control operations already funded under "Drug interdiction and counterdrug activities, Defense" account and additional flying hours in the Persian Gulf budgeted elsewhere.

*Morale, welfare and recreation [MWR].*—The Committee recommends a reduction of $15,000,000 from the fiscal year 1991 MWR requested level as a result of significant down-sizing in force structure and mismanagement. The Air Force is directed to specifically exempt $6,200,000 for child-care activities from this general reduction.

The Committee is especially concerned about recent General Accounting Office [GAO] allegations of widespread mismanagement of MWR funds and programs. Several investigations now are underway.

Recent Air Force audits have uncovered the following examples of mismanagement: $599,877 for 22 golf course projects at Myrtle Beach Air Force Base; $221,000 for an Italian restaurant at Yokota Air Base in Japan even though studies showed it would not be profitable.

The Committee believes that if Air Force MWR programs were better managed they would be able to provide even greater subsidies to those activities which are not profitmaking. The Air Force is directed to report to the Committee, no later than April 15, 1991, on the reforms it intends to take to correct existing problems in the administration and budgeting of MWR programs.

*Deferred requirements.*—The Committee recommends that the full request of $3,721,000 to cover the purchase of dining hall equipment, parts and supplies for vehicle maintenance be denied. At a time of base closures, reduced force structure, and a diminished requirement for supplies, the Committee believes these items should be drawn from available stock.

*Dormitory furnishings.*—The Committee recommends that an increases of $22,053,000 for dormitory furnishings be denied. At a time of base closures, reduced force structure, and a diminished requirement for living accommodations, the Committee believes current requirements for furnishings should be drawn from available stock.

*Milstar.*—The Committee recommends that the full request of $3,822,000 for Milstar operations and maintenance be denied, consistent with the Senate decision to terminate Milstar. The Milstar program is explained elsewhere in these notes.

*Purchased communications.*—The Committee recommends that the proposed increase of $2,336,000 for purchased communications be denied. A portion of this request covers the acquisition of a new information processing system at 14 Air Force locations. This denial is consistent with the Committee's recommendation, contained elsewhere in this report, that spending for automated data processing [ADP] procurement and services be reduced, particularly where there is no demonstration of essential need or where the service has explored alternatives to a new and costly product.

*Aircraft service period adjustments [ASPA].*—The Committee recommends a reduction of $100,000,000 in Air Force depot maintenance funding, based upon their adoption of maintenance methodology used by the Navy and Army in determining workload. The reduction represents the estimated savings of instituting a reliability-centered maintenance program in the Air Force. Under such a program, a physical inspection would be made of all aircraft prior to induction at a depot. Currently, the Air Force returns all aircraft for depot maintenance without regard to the actual need for repairs, while the Navy assesses the condition of each aircraft prior to initiating maintenance.

The Committee observes that the Navy adopted the ASPA program in fiscal year 1985. The Army, which repairs Air Force helicopters, also employs this method to determine depot maintenance workload. The Navy estimates it is saving approximately $200,000,000 per year based on ASPA and attributes ASPA to improved readiness rates from 59 percent to 72 percent. The Committee believes that similar savings could be realized from an ASPA program being started in the Air Force. The Committee understands that the Air Force is reviewing this proposal and is actively considering it for fiscal year 1991. The Committee directs that the Air Force implement a reliability-centered maintenance program by April 15, 1991.

*Automated data processing [ADP] maintenance, service, equipment.*—The Committee recommends that the proposed increase of $3,400,000 for ADP maintenance, service, and equipment be denied. The request represents more than a 50-percent increase over the fiscal year 1990 base and can not be justified as an essential requirement.

*Exchangeable component repair.*—The Committee recommends a reduction of $21,615,000 for exchangeable component repair in fiscal year 1991. The request covers the transition of the B–1B from contractor support to organic depot maintenance and the acquisition of technical data, spares, and tools for the move. The Committee notes that the justification document does not show any corresponding reduction in contractor support funding for the B-1B—funding, that if provided, clearly would represent a windfall to the Air Force. In addition, the Committee denies the requested increase of $1,100,000 to cover spare parts, associated with F-16 flying hours. The Committee believes that this increase is unwarranted in light of overall reductions in flying hours.

*C-17A interim contractor support [ICS].*—The Committee recommends a reduction of $19,500,000 from the amount requested for interim contractor support based upon continuing delays in the C-17A program and a transfer of special operations funding to the Special Operations Command. The Committee seriously questions the need for any operation and maintenance funds for the C-17A when the first research and development airplane is not even assembled. In addition, the Committee directs that all funding for the support of improvements in the SOF fleet of C-130's and H-53's be immediately transferred from the Air Force to the Special Operations Command.

*Printing and reproduction.*—The Committee recommends a reduction of $15,000,000 be made to the fiscal year 1991 request for printing and reproduction. The request represents an increase of approximately 20 percent over the fiscal year 1990 level to cover backlogs in printing. The Air Force currently operates 25 printing plants, 2 of which are overseas. The Committee directs that the Air Force consolidate its printing operations by closing three installations by September 30, 1991. Further, the Air Force is to report to the Committee, no later than April 15, 1991, on why it requires any in-house printing, does not contract out for all of its nonclassified printing, and why it needs any printing operation in Germany. Further, the Air Force shall report to the Committee no later than April 15, 1991, with a plan for the consolidation of its worldwide printing and reproduction operations, including the possibility of consolidating operations with the other U.S. military services.

*Audiovisual.*—The Committee recommends that the proposed increase of $1,492,000 be denied. The request is an increase of approximately 25 percent to enhance graphics capabilities for contracted audiovisual information support as well as logistics data systems. The Committee believes that major reductions in flying hours, maintenance requirements, and overall force structure in fiscal year 1991 will not require a program increase in the audiovisual support provided to AFLC to maintain a photographic history of aircraft maintenance.

*Military Airlift Command [MAC] channel airlift.*—The Committee recommends that the $18,501,000 increase proposed for MAC channel airlift be denied. This account covers the shipment of items back to the United States, or within theater. The Committee believes that an increase in transportation funding of approximately 10 percent is unwarranted during this time of force structure drawdown. The Committee believes that shipments by sea rather than air would be less expensive, obviating the need for this MAC increase.

*Supplies and equipment.*—The Committee recommends that the $11,853,000 increase proposed for the acquisition of previously deferred one-time supplies and equipment is denied. The Committee believes that with force structure being reduced, the purchase of additional items such as typewriters, adding machines, and furniture is unnecessary at this time.

*Contractor support.*—The Committee recommends that the $5,335,000 increase proposed for departmental data processing and contractual services be denied. The request represents a program increase of approximately 25 percent for contract studies and analyses. This denial is consistent with efforts by the Committee this year to cut back on the surge in spending for automated data processing [ADP] procurement and services.

*Departmental supplies, equipment, and other.*—The Committee recommends that the $1,800,000 increase for items such as deferred copy and printing equipment replacement, rentals, transportation, and travel for officials of the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force be denied. The request represents a funding increase of approximately 20 percent, unnecessary at a time of declining force structure and current limits on DOD hiring. The Committee believes that senior Air Force personnel must take the lead in reducing DOD costs, if we are to demand similar, and greater sacrifices, of our enlisted personnel.

*Servicewide support data processing services, supplies, other.*—The Committee recommends that the requested increase of $4,980,000 for Air Force District of Washington and the Air Force Accounting and Finance Center data processing service, automation requirements, and equipment maintenance contracts should be denied. The request represents an increase of nearly 25 percent over fiscal year 1990. The Committee believes that such increases are unwarranted in light of planned consolidation and anticipated reductions in overall force structure.

*Commissary operations.*—The Committee recommends that the requested increase of $14,799,000 for commissary operations, including shelf stocking and warehousing operations be denied. The Committee is opposed to the proposal that the Air Force extend commissary operating hours from 6 to 7 days at 39 stores. This plan is inconsistent with the economizing measures being taken by other service commissaries. The Army has only 30 stores worldwide operating on a 7-day-week basis and the Navy/Marine Corps only 3. Additional hours should be funded from commissary surcharges, not appropriations, if the Air Force insists on increasing hours of operation.

*The Inter-American Air Forces Academy.*—The Committee recommends that the Air Force be permitted to operate and maintain the Inter-American Air Forces Academy [IAAFA] out of funds made available to the Air Force for operation and maintenance. Only military personnel, nationals of Central, South American, and Caribbean countries, are eligible to receive education and training at IAAFA. Further, the Committee directs that the fixed costs of operating and maintaining IAAFA may be paid from funds available for the operation and maintenance of the Air Force without reimbursement.

Furthermore, no individual may be admitted to the Inter-American Air Forces Academy who has been convicted of a human rights violation, or is known to U.S. authorities to have committed, been an accessory to, or in an official capacity had knowledge of but failed to take remedial action concerning a human rights violation.

The Committee directs the Air Force provide instruction in democratic government and human rights protections to each attendee of IAAFA. The Air Force will provide the Committee, no later than March 1, 1991, with a report on the operation of IAAFA, its curriculum and course enrollment, as well as a statistical and biographical profile of its students.

*Hamilton Air Force Base.*—The Committee recommends continuation of the intent of section 9066 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1990, concerning the sale and cleanup of hazardous waste of the sale parcel at Hamilton AFB, CA. The Committee understands that the Department of Defense, the General Services Administration, and the purchaser to have entered into an agreement concerning this property.

In section 8093 of the general provisions, the Committee directs the Air Force to use up to $17,000,000 to execute cleanup of the hazardous waste. It also specifically states that expenditures in excess of $15,000,000 shall be reimbursed to the Air Force upon the closing of the sale of the sale parcel.

Since an agreement has been reached by the Department of Defense, the General Services Administration, and the purchaser, the Committee expects the Department of Defense to request sufficient funds in future Defense budgets to effect this cleanup.

*Civil Air Patrol activities.*—The Committee believes the Civil Air Patrol [CAP] is a vital part of our national security posture. As such, the Committee recommends a general provision that not less than $5,100,000 be provided to the Civil Air Patrol in fiscal year 1991, of which $1,900,000 shall be made available from funds provided for Air Force operation and maintenance. The Committee also recommends that not less than $1,000,000 be earmarked for Civil Air Patrol drug interdiction and surveillance activities from funds provided to the Department of Defense under its "Drug interdiction, Defense" account.

The Committee directs that the maintenance and rehabilitation of CAP aircraft, cadet uniforms, and the FBI fingerprint screening of members are to be considered among the activities eligible for operation and maintenance funding.

## OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE AGENCIES

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $7,738,156,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 8,663,100,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 8,148,163,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $8,148,163,000. This is $514,937,000 below the budget estimate.

### SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

Committee adjustments to the budget estimate are summarized in the following table:

[In thousands of dollars]

| *Program* | *Committee adjustments* |
|---|---|
| Fiscal year 1991 budget request | 8,663,100 |
| Defense Logistics Agency: | |
| Finance center | −17,000 |
| National defense stockpile management | −33,153 |

| Program | Committee adjustments |
|---|---|
| Defense Mapping Agency: Other geophysical activities | −25,000 |
| The joint staff: JCS exercises | −18,325 |
| Washington headquarters services: | |
| Pentagon renovation | −12,503 |
| Pediatric EMS | 300 |
| Clinical psychology | 280 |
| Office of economic adjustment: Economic adjustment | 3,400 |
| Special operations forces: Operation and maintenance | −19,500 |
| Legacy Resource Management Program | 10,000 |
| Command, control, and communication | −10,000 |
| Training and education | −6,500 |
| Recruiting, advertising, and examining | −9,000 |
| Civilian personnel freeze | −114,100 |
| Foreign national civilian | −2,800 |
| Inventory management | −1,400 |
| Stock fund operations costs adjustment | −100,300 |
| Corporate information management | −118,336 |
| Classified programs | −41,000 |
| Total | 8,148,163 |

## COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

*DLA Finance Center.*—Defense Logistics Agency [DLA] established a finance center in fiscal year 1989 to consolidate its accounting and finance activities with the objective of streamlining operations in a cost-effective manner. The fiscal year 1991 DLA budget includes an increase of $31,500,000 for the finance center, constituting more than a 100-percent increase from the amount provided in fiscal year 1990. Of this increase, $17,000,000 is requested for higher civilian personnel costs. No offsetting savings are identified in the budget. The Committee recommends that $17,000,000 for the additional civilian personnel be deleted on the basis that this consolidation was intended to be cost-effective, making additional personnel funding unnecessary.

*National defense stockpile management.*—The Committee recommends that $33,153,000 requested by the Department for management of the national defense stockpile be deleted from the budget. With the change in law included in the Senate-passed authorization bill, these costs can now be appropriately charged to the national defense stockpile, removing the requirement for direct funding.

*Other geophysical activities.*—The budget includes an increase of $67,332,000 for production of mapping, charting, and geodesy products. The need to revise European defense strategies to reflect new geopolitical realities will delay the need for a significant portion of the 5,459 new maps planned to be produced for the U.S. European Command and the U.S. Atlantic Command. The Committee recommends that $25,000,000, that portion of increased funding related to these new maps, be deleted from the budget.

The Defense Mapping Agency [DMA] provides maps and related products to meet the requirements of several organizations. This activity is similar to several others which the Department manages through the defense industrial funds. The Committee recommends that the Department consider making DMA an industrially funded activity during the continuing defense management review.

*JCS exercises.*—The budget includes an increase of $18,325,000 for transportation related to joint training exercises for which the Joint Chiefs of Staff [JCS] is primarily responsible. Recent experience has shown that JCS exercises, such as REFORGER (return of forces to Germany) have been reduced, not increased. The Committee recommendation approves continuation of funding for these efforts at the fiscal year 1990 rate.

*Pentagon renovation.*—The budget request includes $12,503,000 for additional office space to house those DOD components displaced from the Pentagon in anticipation of building renovation. The funding requested in the military construction budget request for Pentagon renovation has been denied, delaying the need for additional office space. The Committee recommends that these funds be denied.

*Economic adjustment.*—The Department of Defense did not adjust the Office of Economic Adjustment's [OEA] budget to reflect increased requirements for assistance to local governments and communities affected economically by defense cutbacks even though the number of such actions will significantly increase in fiscal year 1991. The Committee recommends an increase of $3,400,000 to provide for additional community planning grants and to augment the OEA staff.

The Committee is concerned about the adequacy of administrative regulations to determine eligibility for economic adjustment planning grants. It is the Committee's intention that community assistance planning grants be targeted to assist those communities in greatest need, not simply to increase the number of grant recipients.

The Committee, therefore, strongly supports section 2808 of the Senate-passed Defense authorization which establishes eligibility criteria for both urban and rural communities receiving assistance. However, the Committee views these thresholds as the minimum criteria to determine eligibility for assistance. Clearly, it will be difficult for the OEA to establish uniform criteria that fairly measure the level of defense-related economic impact. However, to ensure that the OEA does not simply become a source of funding to replace the grant assistance provided by other Federal agencies for general economic decline, the Committee expects that the OEA will award planning assistance grants only to communities that can clearly demonstrate serious economic impacts caused by defense industry reductions. Further, communities must demonstrate that there are inadequate local resources to undertake necessary adjustment planning.

*Special Operations Forces [SOF], operation and maintenance.*—The Committee recommends that the increase of $19,500,000 for the Special Operation Forces planning and rehearsal system, part of the joint mission analysis [JMA] process, be denied. The budget assumes that joint mission analysis under the regional CINC's will be completed, but such analysis is behind schedule. The Committee believes it is premature to undertake planning based on the results of the JMA before such analysis is completed. Since a portion of the funding request also is to be used for foreign internal defense, the Committee questions whether support for this activity is really operation and maintenance funds being used to support international military education and training [IMET] programs.

*World university games.*—The Committee is informed of the preparations underway for the 1993 World University Games in Buffalo, NY. The Department of Defense has an extensive history of supporting the safe conduct of international amateur sports events held in the United States. Therefore, the Secretary of Defense may utilize without limitation funds previously appropriated for support of the Goodwill Games in Seattle, WA, that are not expended by November 30, 1990, to provide security, logistical, and other support to Federal, State, and local entities, including the Greater Buffalo Sports Development Commission, in connection with the safe and successful conduct of the 1993 World University Games. The Department may also use Reserve or National Guard forces in support of the 1993 World University Games where such involvement is of training or other value to those forces.

*Legacy Resource Management Program [LRMP].*—The Committee recommends that $10,000,000 be provided to the Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Environment only for the establishment and implementation of the Legacy Resource Management Program. This funding supports an initiative of the Secretary of Defense to inventory and manage the biological, geophysical, and cultural resources, including native American heritage sites, contained on 25 million acres of Department of Defense land both in the United States and overseas. Funding is to be expended in accordance with a natural resource priority list maintained by the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Environment. This program is discussed in more detail elsewhere in this report.

*Evaluation of residual World War II environmental hazards.*—The Committee understands that several sites dating from engagements with Japanese forces during the Second World War pose potential environmental hazards on several islands in the Aleutia chain, including Great Sitkin, Kiska, Attu, and Amchitka. One additional operating location, Elson Lagon, near Barrow, AK, may still have debris and hazardous materials from Second World War deployments. At this time, the degree of potential environmental damage and the nature of the remedial actions necessary to restore these sites is uncertain.

The Committee directs that $900,000 of the funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1991 "Operation and maintenance, defense agencies" account shall be available only for assessment of environmental damage and remediation requirements on Great Sitkin, Kiska, Attu, and Amchitka Islands, and at Elson Lagoon. The Committee directs the Army Corps of Engineers to report the findings of these studies to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations not later than August 1, 1991.

*Dependent student education.*—The Committee is particularly concerned about the effect proposed Army force structure changes will have on school enrollments at the Killeen, TX, School District. The Army's plan to deactivate the 2d Armored Division at Fort Hood will cause the loss of impact aid revenues and, unless counteracted, this loss could severely degrade the quality of education for dependents of Army personnel. The Killeen School District is already suffering shortages because of reductions in Federal impact aid payments. To ameliorate these difficulties, the Committee directs the Department of Defense to provide $1,053,000 to the Killeen school district from funds appropriated to the "Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies" account. There should be no misunderstanding—the Committee has included this funding within the total it has recommended for appropriation to the "Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies" account.

*William Langer Jewel Bearing Plant.*—The Committee is concerned that the Department of Defense did not comply with direction in the Fiscal Year 1990 Appropriations Act regarding provision of $1,000,000 to the Langer Jewel Bearing Plant in fiscal year 1990 for repair and maintenance. The Committee urges the Secretary of Defense to expeditiously release these funds.

## OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $849,243,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 890,400,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 871,360,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $871,360,000. This is $19,040,000 below the budget request.

### SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

Comittee adjustments to the budget estimate are summarized in the following table:

[In thousands of dollars]

| *Program* | *Committee adjustments* |
|---|---|
| Fiscal year 1991 budget request | 890,400,000 |
| Recruiting and advertising | −14,740,000 |
| Inventory management | −4,300,000 |
| Total | 871,360,000 |

## OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $894,800,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 985,924,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 976,114,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $976,114,000. This is $9,810,000 below the budget estimate.

### SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

Committee adjustments to the budget estimate are summarized in the following table:

[In thousands of dollars]

| *Program* | *Committee adjustments* |
|---|---|
| Fiscal year 1991 request | 985,924 |
| Increased use of Reserves | 4,400 |
| Recruiting and advertising | −3,010 |
| Inventory management | −11,200 |
| Total adjustments | 976,114 |

*Reserve C-130 support.*—The Navy has identified a requirement for additional organic airlift aircraft with medium/heavy lift capability for moving cargo and passengers to and from operational units during wartime. Funds were appropriated in fiscal year 1990 for procurement of two C-130 aircraft to initiate this effort. It is essential that sufficient funds be available to maintain these aircraft. To this end, the Committee directs that of the funds appropriated for "Operation and maintenance, Navy Reserve," $10,300,000 is to be used only for spare parts and intermediate support for two Navy Reserve C-130 aircraft maintained by Fleet Logistics Support Squadron Five Four (VR-54) at the Naval Air Station, New Orleans, LA.

## OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $77,400,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 86,100,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 83,180,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $83,180,000. This is $2,920,000 below the budget request.

### SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

Committee adjustments to the budget estimate are summarized in the following table:

[In thousands of dollars]

| *Program* | *Committee adjustments* |
|---|---|
| Fiscal year 1991 budget request | 86,100 |
| Recruiting and advertising | −1,620 |
| Inventory management | −1,300 |
| Total | 83,180 |

## OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $978,500,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 1,042,500,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 1,055,360,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,055,360,000. This is $12,860,000 above the budget request.

### SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

Committee adjustments to the budget estimate are summarized in the following table:

[In thousands of dollars]

| *Program* | *Committee adjustments* |
|---|---|
| Fiscal year 1991 budget request | 1,042,500 |
| Increased use of Reserves | +18,000 |
| Recruiting and advertising | −2,240 |
| Inventory management | −2,900 |
| Total | 1,055,360 |

## OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $1,839,063,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 1,988,500,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 1,960,360,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,960,360,000. This is $28,140,000 below the budget request.

### SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

Committee adjustments to the budget estimate are summarized in the following table:

[In thousands of dollars]

| *Program* | *Committee adjustments* |
|---|---|
| Fiscal year 1991 budget request | 1,988,500 |
| Recruiting and advertising | −10,040 |
| Inventory management | −18,100 |
| Total | 1,960,360 |

## OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $1,981,900,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 2,175,400,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 2,217,990,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,217,990,000. This is $42,590,000 above the budget request.

### SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

Committee adjustments to the budget estimate are summarized in the following table:

[In thousands of dollars]

| *Program* | *Committee adjustments* |
|---|---|
| Fiscal year 1991 budget request | 2,175,400 |
| Increased use of Reserves | 53,000 |
| Recruiting and advertising | −1,610 |
| Inventory management | −8,800 |
| Total | 2,217,990 |

## NATIONAL BOARD FOR THE PROMOTION OF RIFLE PRACTICE

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $4,633,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 5,600,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 5,600,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $5,600,000, the same as requested.

## COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $3,945,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 5,600,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 5,500,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $5,500,000. This is $100,000 below the budget estimate.

The Committee recommends a reduction in the amount of growth requested for the court of appeals, as approved in the

Senate-passed authorization. This adjustment reduces administrative overhead growth from the requested 33 percent to a more reasonable increase of 20 percent.

## ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $601,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 817,000,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 1,062,527,000 |

### COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

*Environmental restoration.*—The Committee recommends an increase in funding for environmental restoration of $245,527,000 as approved by the Senate-passed Defense authorization. This represents an increase of approximately 50 percent above the current funding level. The increase will permit the Department of Defense to move beyond the study and evaluation of hazardous waste sites and proceed with accelerated cleanup efforts. The Committee directs the Department of Defense to give priority to the cleanup of contamination at Army ammunition plants and to report in its budget justification document for fiscal year 1992 its remediation plan for these sites.

*Adequate competition for DOD site remediation.*—The Committee shares the concern of the Authorization Committee that DOD's environmental restoration program depends on the participation of competent private construction contractors experienced in environmental cleanup process and technique. Competition for the contracts is inhibited by the apparently rapid decline in the availability of surety bonds for DOD environmental remediation projects, resulting in higher costs and lower quality cleanup of hazardous waste sites. Most construction contractors are unable to obtain legally required bonds for large environmental cleanups at DOD sites.

*Umatilla Army Depot.*—The Umatilla Army Depot in Oregon is scheduled for realignment under the base closure act. This conventional and chemical weapons depot has significant environmental pollution and is one site currently listed on the national priorities list. The Committee urges the Department of Defense to fund a consortium of State and local officials to participate in the development of an orderly, comprehensive long-term plan for the protection and productive development of area resources as the Army proceeds with the phase-down, cleanup, and mitigation of the Umatilla Army Depot.

*Badger Ammunition Plant.*—The Committee requests that the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Environment give priority to the environmental cleanup of the Badger Ammunition Plant in Wisconsin. Previous studies suggest the most feasible and economical method of meeting discharge requirements may be the construction of a surge pond and a pressurized pipeline to the Wisconsin River. The adoption of this plan would allow the remediation of pollution from discharged waste water that has percolated into the ground water. The Committee believes that this scheme would allow the Badger plant to meet current environmental standards and should be actively pursued.

*The handling of potentially recyclable wastes/materials by DRMO.*—The Committee joins with the Authorizing Committee in directing the Department of Defense to review the applicable governing statutes relating to surety bonding, the Miller Act (404 U.S.C. 270(a)-270(d)) and CERCLA, and make the results of its report available to the Committee. This review should include a discussion of the technical risks inherent in all large remediation actions and the applicability of CERCLA section 119 protection of DOD sites. The Committee believes that these problems should be carefully examined to facilitate the prompt and cost-effective cleanup of DOD hazardous waste sites.

## HUMANITARIAN RELIEF

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $12,800,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 13,000,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 13,000,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $13,000,000.

This appropriation provides for the transportation of excesss Department of Defense nonlethal supplies for humanitarian purposes.

# TITLE III

# PROCUREMENT

## ESTIMATES AND APPROPRIATION SUMMARY

The fiscal year 1991 Department of Defense procurement budget request totals $77,288,050,000 and a transfer of $1,359,050,000. The accompanying bill recommends $65,489,817,000 in new budget authority.

In its recommendations for procurement programs, the Committee has recognized that global changes have generally decreased requirements for current generation weapons systems, but not the need to invest in new technology for the future. The Committee's recommendations maintain and expand the qualitative advantage that U.S. weapons systems have achieved; and recognize that, as recommended by the Defense Department, it is necessary to forego continuation of many current programs today in favor of investing in technological superiority for the future. However, the Committee also realizes that concurrent development and production is no longer as necessary as it was at the height of cold war tensions, and has, therefore, recommended several production deferrals to assure that successful developmental testing of weapons systems precedes procurement decisions.

The Committee has given careful consideration to adjustments driven by anticipated force structure reductions, the shifting focus from heavy conventional forces to lighter, more lethal, and more mobile forces; and the redistribution of equipment among Active Forces, Guard, and Reserves. In addition, the Committee has attempted to identify programs with decreased requirements resulting from major policy adjustments, schedule delays, and cost savings. In general, the specific recommendations discussed are consistent with the Senate passed Department of Defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1991.

The President recommended several program terminations in the budget request; the Committee has generally concurred with these efforts. In the text which follows, the Committee provides descriptions of its specific programmatic adjustments.

*Restrictions on modifications.*—The Committee recommends a new general provision section 8031 to restrict the funding of modifications for equipment which is planned to be retired within 5 years of the completion of the modification. Currently, there is no overall defense policy which restricts funding for modifications on retiring equipment. However, the Committee understands that the Air Force has adopted a policy similar to the one recommended by the Committee.

Noting that likely changes will accompany the fiscal year 1992 6-year defense plan and necessitate the retirement of many items of equipment unanticipated in the fiscal year 1991 budget, the Committee believes this change will be a useful and significant cost avoiding provision. The provision specifically exempts safety modifications. Within this context safety modifications are those which correct material or other deficiencies required to ensure safety of personnel, systems, or equipment, which if uncorrected would result in unacceptable risk to personnel. This provision is not intended to supersede any other more restrictive Department of Defense or military department policy on modifications.

*Participation of the blind and handicapped in DOD contracting.*—Section 8088 is designed to encourage firms performing Department of Defense contracts to increase their use of the various nonprofit agencies which provide work opportunities for the blind and other severely handicapped. To attain this objective, the provision would authorize a firm to count subcontract awards to such agencies toward the attainment of the firm's goal for the subcontract participation of small business concerns, negotiated pursuant to section 8(d) of the Small Business Act.

Under present law, 41 U.S.C. 46–48, the so-called Javits-Wagner-O'Day [JWOD] Act, Federal agencies are required to purchase, on a noncompetitive basis, various products and services furnished by workshops for the blind and handicapped. Products and services provided this preferential status must be approved by the Committee for the Purchase From the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped, established by the JWOD Act. The Committee is responsible for overall policy management of the program. The statute requires a detailed process for adding products or services to the program's so-called procurement list, a process that affords extensive opportunity for public participation.

To provide additional work opportunities to the workshops for the blind and handicapped, the Congress established a 3-year pilot program that makes such nonprofit workshops eligible to compete for Federal agency contracting opportunities set-aside for exclusive competition among small business concerns under section 15(a) of the Small Business Act. The pilot program was authorized by section 133(a) of Public Law 100–590, the Small Business Administration Reauthorization and Amendment Act of 1988. The pilot program expires on September 30, 1993.

Section 133(b) of Public Law 100–590 required the General Accounting Office [GAO] to evaluate the pilot program and to report to the Committees on Small Business of the Senate and House of Representatives. GAO's interim report, "Low Participation in Set-Aside Program Expected for Sheltered Workshops" (GAO/RCED–90–192), was submitted to the Small Business Committees on August 6, 1990. It included observations by representatives of various workshops for the blind and handicapped predicting minimal benefit due to the inability to establish stable business relationships with agencies due to the substantial competition often existing for a contracting opportunity set-aside for small business. They also noted that additional impediments flowed from other provisions of the authorizing statute.

The demonstration subcontracting program provided by section 8088 of this act represents an enhancement of the prime contract pilot program authorized by section 133(a) of Public Law 100–590, unimpaired by the various restrictions that may apparently limit full participation by the workshops. The regulations required by subsection (d) shall permit a prime contractor or a subcontractor required to negotiate a subcontracting plan with goals for participation by small business concerns and small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals pursuant to section 8(d) of the Small Business Act to count toward its small business goal any subcontract award for any product or service furnished by a qualified nonprofit agency for the blind and other severely handicapped, which was made on or after October 1, 1990, and prior to October 1, 1991. To permit the maintenance of stable business relationships, noncompetitive subcontract awards to such entities at a fair and reasonable price are to be authorized.

The Committee directs that the GAO conduct a review of the results of the demonstration subcontracting program under section 8088 of this act and submit an interim report as part of its evaluation of the pilot prime contract, pursuant to section 133(c) of Public Law 100-590. Such interim report shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and Small Business by February 1, 1992.

The Committee on Appropriations places great importance on expanding the participation of workshops for the blind and other severely handicapped in the Government procurement process. The Committee urges the Committee on Small Business to consider amending the pilot prime contract program for blind and handicapped workshops under section 133(a) of Public Law 100-590 to provide for a Government-wide subcontracting program during fiscal years 1992 and 1993 based upon the results of this demonstration program.

## AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $3,745,138,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 1,583,200,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 853,366,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $853,366,000, a decrease of $729,834,000 from the President's budget.

This appropriation provides funding for the acquisition of tactical and utility airplanes and helicopters, including associated electronics and communications equipment and armament; modification and modernization of in-service aircraft; flight simulators; ground support equipment; production base support; and depot reparable assemblies, components, transmissions, and gear boxes.

### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

The President's request for Army aviation programs represents a significant reduction from the levels funded throughout the 1990's. The reduction is related to the forward funding of the Apache program in 1990 and the planned termination of the Army Helicopter Improvement Program [AHIP]. In addition, funding for spare parts has been transferred to the stock funds. Together, these have reduced the President's request in excess of 50 percent from the amounts appropriated in fiscal year 1990. In general, the Committee supports the programs requested by the President's budget. The majority of the reductions recommended by the Committee result from the transfer of 24 UH-60 helicopters and the CH-47 modernization program to National Guard and Army Reserves. In addition, the Committee supports the Army's plan to scale back on current production in favor of the follow-on light helicopter program. The specific programs recommended for appropriation are listed in the table which follows.

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

| | Budget | | Committee recommendation | | Senate compared to-- | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Budget amount |
| AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY | | | | | | |
| AIRCRAFT | | | | | | |
| FIXED WING | | | | | | |
| GRISLY HUNTER (TIARA) | 1 | 10,430 | -- | --- | -10,430 | -1 |
| RC-12H/K RECON AIRPLANE (TIARA) | 5 | 87,407 | 5 | 62,407 | -25,000 | -- |
| ROTARY | | | | | | |
| TOTAL PACKAGE FIELDING | -- | 16,200 | -- | --- | -16,200 | -- |
| AH-64 ATTACK HELICOPTER (APACHE) (MYP) | -- | 104,226 | -- | 104,226 | --- | -- |
| UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP) | 72 | 272,118 | 48 | 116,118 | -156,000 | -24 |
| UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP) (AP-CY) | -- | 197,191 | -- | 47,691 | -149,500 | -- |
| TOTAL, AIRCRAFT | | 687,572 | | 330,442 | -357,130 | |
| MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT | | | | | | |
| INSTALLATION OF MODERNIZATION EQUIPMENT | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MODERNIZATION OF EQUIPMENT, O&M TRANSFER | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| OV-1 MODS SURVEILLANCE AIRPLANE (TIARA) | -- | 200 | -- | 200 | --- | -- |
| RC-12D MODS (TIARA) | -- | 31,604 | -- | 31,604 | --- | -- |
| RU-21 MODS (TIARA) | -- | 9,737 | -- | 9,737 | --- | -- |
| AH1S MODS | -- | 7,977 | -- | 7,977 | --- | -- |
| AH-64 MODS | -- | 85,687 | -- | 78,587 | -7,100 | -- |
| CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER (MODS) (MYP) | -- | 237,761 | -- | 11,000 | -226,761 | -- |
| CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER (MODS) (MYP) (AP-CY) | -- | 56,443 | -- | --- | -56,443 | -- |
| OH-58 MODS | -- | 24,695 | -- | 20,495 | -4,200 | -- |
| UH-1 MODS | -- | 26,838 | -- | 26,838 | --- | -- |
| UH-60 MODS | -- | 83,527 | -- | 72,727 | -10,800 | -- |
| AHIP | -- | 47,993 | -- | 13,193 | -34,800 | -- |
| ASE MODS | -- | 11,453 | -- | 11,453 | --- | -- |
| ACFT 9WW MODS | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| SOF AIRCRAFT MODS | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| SOF AIRCRAFT MODS (AP-CY) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TRACTOR HEAVY MODS | -- | 767 | -- | 767 | --- | -- |
| RETIREMENT OF OBSOLETE AIRCRAFT | -- | --- | -- | -40,400 | -40,400 | -- |
| TOTAL, MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT | | 624,682 | | 244,178 | -380,504 | |
| SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES | | | | | | |
| GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS | | | | | | |
| AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT | -- | 107,890 | -- | 107,890 | --- | -- |
| OTHER SUPPORT | | | | | | |
| AIRBORNE COMMAND & CONTROL CONSOLES | -- | --- | -- | 7,800 | +7,800 | -- |
| AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 43,634 | -- | 43,634 | --- | -- |
| COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT | -- | 67,894 | -- | 67,894 | --- | -- |
| AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL | -- | 8,690 | -- | 8,690 | --- | -- |
| SYNTHETIC FLIGHT TRAINING SYSTEMS | -- | 10,426 | -- | 10,426 | --- | -- |
| INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | -- | 27,838 | -- | 27,838 | --- | -- |
| WAR CONSUMABLES | -- | 4,574 | -- | 4,574 | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES | | 270,946 | | 278,746 | +7,800 | |
| SEQUESTRATION REDUCTION | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT CONSOLIDATION | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY | | 1,583,200 | | 853,366 | -729,834 | |

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENTS

*Grisly hunter.*—The Committee recommends no funds for the grisly hunter program, consistent with Senate authorization. The program has suffered irreparable damage and is unable to meet the requirements established by the Congress last year. In addition, the mission for which this classified program was requested is no longer valid. While a new mission has been suggested, it is unlikely that the specific capabilities of this system are applicable to the proposed new mission.

*RC-12H/K.*—The Committee recommends $62,407,000 for the RC-12H/K program, a reduction of $25,000,000 consistent with Senate authorization.

*Total package fielding.*—The budget request includes $16,200,000 for a new program to provide administrative and logistics support for programs in production. Previously, such procurement-related funds were provided in each respective program. The Committee does not agree that this new program element is useful or necessary and, therefore, recommends no funds for this purpose. Logistic and administrative support costs are more appropriately paid from operating funds or, under some conditions, within the specific acquisition program.

*UH-60 Black Hawk utility helicopters.*—The Committee recommends $116,118,000 in this appropriation for purchase of 48 Black Hawk helicopters for the Army and an additional $156,000,000 in National Guard equipment purchases for 24 helicopters. Advance procurement of $47,691,000 is recommended for fiscal year 1992 requirements.

The amount provided is sufficient to provide the requested 72 helicopters. The advance funding has been reduced by $149,500,000, the amount requested for multiyear procurement. The Committee does not support continuing multiyear procurement of the Black Hawk. Multiyear contracting is only recommended for programs in which a stable requirement has been determined. The Committee believes that fiscal pressures and force structure reductions will lead the Army to reduce its overall and annual purchases of UH-60 helicopters. As such, it is no longer appropriate to use multiyear contracting for this program.

*AH-64 Apache modifications.*—The budget requests $7,100,000 for a new trainer associated with the air-to-air Stinger program. A GAO review has determined that the contract for this trainer is not required until 1994. Therefore, no funds are recommended.

*CH-47 Chinook modifications.*—The Committee recommendation transfers all funding for the CH-47D modernization program to the National Guard and Reserve appropriation, consistent with the recommendation contained in the Senate authorization bill. In addition, the Committee has deleted the $3,200,000 requested for the Navstar global positioning system. The Committee understands funds for GPS are not required until fiscal year 1992.

*UH-60 Black Hawk modifications.*—The Committee recommends $72,727,000 for UH-60 modifications, a reduction of $10,800,000 from the request. The amount reduced is related to the external stores support [ESS] and the related improved airspeed systems. The ESS is a new start with a cost estimated at $100,000,000. The

Committee is not convinced that the modification is needed, considering fiscal constraints and force structure changes.

*Other adjustments.*—The Committee recommends the following adjustments consistent with Senate authorization:

[In thousands of dollars]

| Program | Request | Recommended | Adjustment |
|---|---|---|---|
| OH-58C | 24,695 | 20,495 | −4,200 |
| AHIP | 47,993 | 13,193 | −34,800 |
| Obsolete aircraft | | −40,400 | −40,400 |
| Airborne command/control consoles | | 7,800 | +7,800 |

## MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $2,708,399,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 2,623,500,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 2,103,231,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,103,231,000, a decrease of $520,269,000 below the President's budget request.

This appropriation finances the procurement, production, modification, and modernization of surface-to-air and surface-to-surface missile systems; air defense control and coordination systems; antitank/assault missile systems; and related support and production base equipment.

### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

The following table details the Committee recommendation in comparison to the President's budget request:

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

|  | Budget |  | Committee recommendation |  | Senate compared to-- |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Budget amount |
| MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OTHER MISSILES |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CHAPARRAL | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| NON-LINE OF SIGHT MSL (AP-CY) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| ADS HVY MSL SYSTEM | 220 | 235,584 | -- | --- | -235,584 | -220 |
| ADATS PRIOR YEAR SAVINGS | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| ADS HVY MSL SYSTEM (AP-CY) | -- | 36,200 | -- | --- | -36,200 | -- |
| HAWK MSL SYSTEM | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT | -- | 4,850 | -- | 4,850 | --- | -- |
| PATRIOT(MYP) | 817 | 883,152 | 817 | 704,952 | -178,200 | -- |
| STINGER | 6,922 | 252,428 | 6,922 | 252,428 | --- | -- |
| AVENGER (PED MT STINGER) (MYP) | 88 | 97,391 | 88 | 97,391 | --- | -- |
| AVENGER (PED MT STINGER) (MYP) (AP-CY) | -- | 25,700 | -- | 25,700 | --- | -- |
| AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LASER HELLFIRE SYSTEM | 3,002 | 123,279 | 3,002 | 106,279 | -17,000 | -- |
| ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYSTEM |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ADVANCED ANTITANK WPNS SYS MED (AAWS-M) | -- | 15,550 | -- | 15,550 | --- | -- |
| TOW 2 | 13,284 | 219,465 | 10,284 | 175,497 | -43,968 | -3,000 |
| MULTIPLE LAUNCH ROCKET SYSTEM (MYP) | 24,000 | 313,915 | 24,000 | 313,915 | --- | -- |
| MULTIPLE LAUNCH ROCKET SYSTEM (MYP) (AP-CY) | -- | 59,600 | -- | 59,600 | --- | -- |
| ARMY TACTICAL MISSILE SYS (ATACMS) | 318 | 168,678 | 318 | 168,678 | --- | -- |
| ARMY TACTICAL MISSILE SYS (ATACMS) (AP-CY) | -- | 18,500 | -- | 18,500 | --- | -- |
| PRIOR YEAR REDUCTIONS (ATACMS) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TOTAL PACKAGE FIELDING (MSL) | -- | 9,317 | -- | --- | -9,317 | -- |
| TOTAL, OTHER MISSILES |  | 2,463,609 |  | 1,943,340 | -520,269 |  |
| MODIFICATION OF MISSILES |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MODIFICATIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PATRIOT MODS | -- | 20,856 | -- | 20,856 | --- | -- |
| HAWK MODS | -- | 43,615 | -- | 43,615 | --- | -- |
| TOW MODS | -- | 45,385 | -- | 45,385 | --- | -- |
| MLRS MODS | -- | 17,468 | -- | 17,468 | --- | -- |
| TRACTOR RIG | -- | 8,050 | -- | 8,050 | --- | -- |
| DEPOT MODIFICATION APPLICATION | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, MODIFICATION OF MISSILES |  | 135,374 |  | 135,374 | --- |  |
| SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AIR DEFENSE TARGETS | -- | 12,503 | -- | 12,503 | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (MISSILES) | -- | 3,627 | -- | 3,627 | --- | -- |
| PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT | -- | 8,387 | -- | 8,387 | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES |  | 24,517 |  | 24,517 | --- |  |
| TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY |  | 2,623,500 |  | 2,103,231 | -520,269 |  |

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENTS

*Air defense system—heavy [ADS] missile system.*—The President's fiscal year 1991 budget requests $235,584,000 in procurement and $36,200,000 in advance procurement for the air defense system—heavy, also known as the air defense antitank system [ADATS].

Initial operational test and evaluation [IOT&E] conducted February through May of this year concluded that the ADATS missile system has made no progress in solving the repeated equipment failures which continue to plague this system. In recognition of the contractor's inability to show a positive trend in improving reliability, availability, and maintainability [RAM], the Army has informed the Committee that it intends to restructure the full-scale development [FSD] program necessitating a 1- to 3-year delay in the production program.

The Committee has weighed this announcement by the Army with the dramatic changes within the Warsaw Pact and the prospect of major United States troop reductions in Europe and now questions whether or not the original program justification for the ADATS system is still valid. Further, the Committee has been informed that, as a result of proposed U.S. force structure reductions, the total number of ADATS fire units and missiles to be produced will be cut and ADATS unit price and total program cost will grow substantially.

Because of continued reliability problems, a substantial program cost increase, a decreased Warsaw Pact threat, and possible lower cost short-range air defense system alternatives, the Committee agrees with the Senate Armed Services Committee's recommendation to terminate the ADATS program.

While the Committee agrees with the Senate authorization report that there is a need for a lower cost alternative to the ADATS, the Committee does not support the additional $10,000,000 provided in Army RDT&E to start a new development program for a Stinger under armor. The Committee notes that Congress is already funding a Marine Corps short-range air defense development program, the light armored vehicle air defense [LAV-AD], which will provide an armor vehicle with Stingers, Hydra-70 rockets, and a gun. The Committee sees no need to begin a duplicative development effort to provide the Army with a Stinger under armor when a system is already in development which may meet the Army's requirements.

*Patriot missile.*—The President has requested $883,152,000 in procurement funding for the Patriot air defense missile system in fiscal year 1991.

The Senate-passed authorization bill reduced prior-year Patriot funding by $92,400,000 reflecting the recent decision by the Department of Defense to reduce Army force structure by at least five heavy divisions over the next 5 years. The Committee agrees with this reduction and directs the Army to use these available prior-year funds to partially fund their fiscal year 1991 Patriot requirements. Further, as discussed in the ADATS section, the Committee has decided to terminate the air defense heavy system because of continued reliability problems. The Congress appropriated funding in fiscal year 1990 for initial procurement of the ADATS system.

These funds are no longer needed and, therefore, the Committee directs the Army to use $85,800,000 of these available prior-year appropriations to fully fund the Patriot missile program in fiscal year 1991.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $704,952,000 in new budget authority and directs the use of $178,200,000 of prior-year appropriations to fully fund the fiscal year 1991 Patriot missile program.

*TOW 2 missile.*—The Army has requested $219,465,000 for the procurement of 13,284 TOW 2 missiles in fiscal year 1991. The Committee recommends an appropriation of $175,497,000, a reduction of $43,968,000, for the procurement of as many missiles as the Army can buy with this funding level.

Within the amounts requested, the Army has budgeted $43,968,000 for the procurement of 3,000 missiles from a second-source contractor, intending to compete the TOW 2 missile buy between two fully qualified producers in fiscal year 1992.

Since the President submitted the fiscal year 1991 budget, the Army has decided that there will not be sufficient funding in future budgets to efficiently support two TOW 2 missile producers, and, therefore, have canceled their plans to bring on a second-source producer. The Committee applauds the Army's foresight and supports its decision to discontinue its efforts to facilitize a second source producer. The $43,968,000 reduction recommended by the Committee is the funding within the budget request which would have supported the second-source contract.

*Total package fielding (MSL).*—The budget request includes $9,317,000 for a new budget line which would provide administrative and logistic support for programs in production. Previously, such procurement-related funds were provided in each program's budget line. The Committee does not agree that this new program element is useful or necessary and, therefore, recommends no funding for this purpose. Logistic and administrative support costs are more appropriately paid from operating funds or, under some conditions, within the specific acquisition program.

The Committee recommends accepting the following authorization adjustments:

OTHER ADJUSTMENTS

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget request | Committee recommendation | Change from budget |
|---|---|---|---|
| Laser Hellfire system | 123,279 | 106,279 | −17,000 |

## PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $2,707,611,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 1,312,300,000 |
| By transfer | (860,300,000) |
| Committee recommendation | 1,895,552,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,895,552,000, an increase of $583,252,000 above the President's budget request.

This appropriation provides for the procurement of tanks, armored personnel carriers, and combat engineer vehicles. Funds are also provided for the acquisition of crew-served weapons, grenade launcher, towed and self-propelled guns and howitzers, mortars, laser rangefinders, associated training equipment, modification of in-service equipment, initial spares and repair parts, major components, and production base support.

### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

The following table details the Committee recommendations in comparison to the budget request:

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

| | Budget | | Committee recommendation | | Senate compared to-- | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Budget amount |
| PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY | | | | | | |
| TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES | | | | | | |
| BRADLEY FIGHTING VEHICLE FAMILY (MYP) | 600 | 657,360 | 600 | 657,360 | --- | -- |
| BRADLEY FIGHTING VEHICLE FAMILY (MYP) (AP-CY) | -- | 30,500 | -- | 30,500 | --- | -- |
| BRADLEY FVS TRAINING DEVICES | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| FIELD ARTILLERY AMMUNITION SUPPORT VEH | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| M1 ABRAMS TANK TRAINING DEVICES | -- | 15,039 | -- | 15,039 | --- | -- |
| M1 ABRAMS TANK SERIES (MYP) | -- | --- | 225 | 747,324 | +747,324 | +225 |
| (BY TRANSFER) | 225 | (747,324) | -- | --- | (-747,324) | -225 |
| M1 ABRAMS TANK SERIES (MYP) (AP-CY) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES | | | | | | |
| BFVS SERIES (MOD) | -- | 146,135 | -- | 146,135 | --- | -- |
| HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109 SER(MOD) | -- | 206,827 | -- | --- | -206,827 | -- |
| M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD) | -- | --- | -- | 144,137 | +144,137 | -- |
| (BY TRANSFER) | -- | (80,137) | -- | --- | (-80,137) | -- |
| M1 TO M1A1 UPGRADE PROGRAM | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| 9WW | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $2M (TCV-WTCV) | -- | 1,000 | -- | 1,000 | --- | -- |
| TOTAL PACKAGE FIELDING | -- | 30,761 | -- | --- | -30,761 | -- |
| (BY TRANSFER) | -- | (32,839) | -- | --- | (-32,839) | -- |
| HOST NATION SUPPORT | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES | | | | | | |
| SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (TCV-WTCV) | -- | 955 | -- | 955 | --- | -- |
| PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV) | -- | 83,166 | -- | 20,566 | -62,600 | -- |
| REGIONAL MAINTENANCE TRAINING SITES-EQUIP | -- | 10,322 | -- | 10,322 | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES | | 1,182,065 | | 1,773,338 | +591,273 | |
| WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES | | | | | | |
| HOWITZER, LIGHT, TOWED, 105MM, M119 | 42 | 26,235 | 42 | 26,235 | --- | -- |
| SOF WEAPONS | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MACHINE GUN, 7.62MM, M60 | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MACHINE GUN, 5.56MM (SAW) | 7,241 | 12,450 | 7,241 | 12,450 | --- | -- |
| GRENADE LAUNCHER, AUTO, 40MM, MK19-3 | -- | --- | 820 | --- | --- | +820 |
| LAUNCHER, SMOKE GRENADE | 2,763 | 1,732 | 2,763 | 1,732 | --- | -- |
| MORTAR, 120MM | 196 | 12,326 | 196 | 12,326 | --- | -- |
| M16 RIFLE | 33,160 | 14,786 | 33,160 | 14,786 | --- | -- |
| SNIPER WEAPON SYSTEM | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| PERSONAL DEFENSE WEAPON, 9MM | 35,101 | 8,021 | -- | --- | -8,021 | -35,101 |
| VEH RAPID FIRE WPN SYS-BUSHMASTER (MYP) | 611 | 25,466 | 611 | 25,466 | --- | -- |
| VEH RAPID FIRE WPN SYS-BUSHMASTER (MYP) (AP-CY) | -- | 2,000 | -- | 2,000 | --- | -- |
| MODIFICATION OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBA | | | | | | |
| M16A1 RIFLE MODS | -- | 5,623 | -- | 5,623 | --- | -- |
| MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $2.0M (WOCV-WTCV) | -- | 608 | -- | 608 | --- | -- |
| MODERNIZATION OF EQUIP-O&M TRANSFER | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| INSTALLATION OF MODERNIZATION EQUIPMENT | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES | | | | | | |
| SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (WOCV-WTCV) | -- | 1,999 | -- | 1,999 | --- | -- |
| PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV) | -- | 17,436 | -- | 17,436 | --- | -- |
| INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS | -- | 1,553 | -- | 1,553 | --- | -- |
| GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT CONSOLIDATION | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES | | 130,235 | | 122,214 | -8,021 | |
| TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY | | 1,312,300 | | 1,895,552 | +583,252 | |
| TRANSFER FROM OTHER ACCOUNTS | | (860,300) | | --- | (-860,300) | |
| TOTAL FUNDING AVAILABLE | | 2,172,600 | | 1,895,552 | -277,048 | |

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENTS

### TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES

*Bradley fighting vehicle.*—The General Accounting Office has identified fiscal year 1990 contract savings within the Bradley fighting vehicle program. The Committee directs the Army to use $12,300,000 of these available prior-year funds to procure 820 MK-19 40 mm grenade launchers in fiscal year 1991.

*M-1 Abrams tank.*—The Army's budget request includes $747,324,000 to procure 163 M-1A1 and 62 M-1A2 (block II) main battle tanks in fiscal year 1991. Further, the Department of Defense has notified Congress of its intent to terminate the M-1 tank program after the fiscal year 1991 procurement and close all production facilities after the delivery of the final fiscal year 1991 tank in March 1993.

The Army's M-1A2 (block II) tank is the third in a series of block modifications to the Abrams M-1 main battle tank. The M-1A2 differs from the M-1A1 in several ways: an improved tank commander's weapons station and independent thermal viewer, new core electronics, possible survivability enhancements, a new position/navigation system, and a rangefinder.

Important to note, the Army does not plan to field any of the M-1A2 block II tanks, but rather build the 62 M-1A2's to prove out the production line for the block II tank. There are no plans to field any block II tanks in combat unit but, instead, the tanks would be scattered throughout the Army (for example, 14 would be located at the armor school at Fort Knox and 20 at Aberdeen Proving Grounds).

This subcommittee has continually supported the M-1 tank procurement program at or above the President's budget request. In fiscal year 1990, this Committee supported additional funding for 33 M-1A1 tanks beyond the budget request in order to continue a production rate which would support both tank production facilities at Lima, OH, and Warren, MI. This Committee was also responsible for adding an additional $40,000,000 in advance procurement funding to continue the economic production of M-1 tanks at both facilities in fiscal year 1991.

The Committee recommends full support of the Army's fiscal year 1991 tank production request in the amount of $747,324,000. The Committee, however, does not recommend that any of this funding be obligated for M-1A2 block II tanks in fiscal year 1991 because operational testing will not be completed and the Milestone III low-rate production decision will not be made for the block II tank until January 1992, well beyond the end of the fiscal year.

Further, the Committee finds it cannot support the Department of Defense's decision to terminate the M-1 Abrams program after fiscal year 1991. While there is merit to the Army's analysis of declining force structure and lower defense budgets necessitating termination, this decision must also be weighted against the need to maintain a $2,000,000,000 tank production industrial base that will go cold before the next generation, block III tank is fielded. In this light, the Committee will support the plan to continue the M-1 tank line in the future with a combination of foreign military sales and an upgrade program of older 105 mm M–1 tanks to the 120 mm M–1A1 configuration. This is the lowest cost alternative of all upgrade options and, therefore, will put the least strain on outyear Army budgets while, at the same time, keep the tank industrial base warm. The Committee does not preclude a future decision by the Department to change this strategy and begin upgrading basic M–1 tanks to the M–1A2 block II configuration after operational testing is completed and the production decision is made in January 1992. The Committee recommends that $64,000,000 be added to the Army's request to begin the first year of this upgrade program.

## MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES

*Howitzer improvement program [HIP].*—The Army has requested $206,827,000 for the procurement of 163 kits for the continuation of the howitzer improvement program for the 155 mm M–109 self-propelled artillery weapon system. The HIP program is designed to improve the M–109 howitzer's responsiveness, effectiveness, survivability, and maintainability.

The Congress has already authorized and appropriated a total of $103,304,000 in fiscal year 1989 and 1990 for the procurement of 59 modification kits. However, due to the delays in the program and a July 1990 decision by the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Research and Development to postpone low-rate initial production [LRIP] as a result of unacceptable cost estimate by the contractor, none of the prior-year funds have been put on contract. As of August 1, 1990, over $95,000,000 of prior-year funds are still unobligated.

The Congress is becoming increasingly frustrated with the HIP program which entered full-scale development in November 1984. The Committee notes that this is a modification program to an already existing system, not a ground up design, and, after almost 6 years of development, is still not in production at a realistic cost. As a result of these continued delays and the changes in the world and budget environments, the Committee must question the need to continue this modification program when the current estimate of the unit cost has increased 100 percent and the estimate of the total program cost now over $1,990,000,000.

Further, the Army is planning to develop a new howitzer within the armored systems modernization [ASM] program which the Committee fully supports and believes should be accelerated. The Committee, however, will not recommend termination of the howitzer improvement program at this time but is now on record that, unless major adjustments in the development and production program are made in fiscal year 1991, funding for this program in fiscal year 1992 and beyond is in serious jeopardy. The Committee recommends that the full fiscal year 1991 request be deferred in recognition of the Assistant Secretary of the Army's decision not to allow the HIP program enter into low-rate production at this time.

*Total package fielding (MSL).*—The budget request includes $63,600,000 for a new budget line which would provide administrative and logistic support for programs in production. Previously, such procurement-related funds were provided in each program's budget line. The Committee does not agree that this new program element is useful or necessary and, therefore, recommends no funding for this purpose. Logistic and administrative support costs are more appropriately paid from operating funds or, under some conditions, within the specific acquisition program.

### SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES

*Production base support [TCV-WTCV].*—The Army's fiscal year 1991 production base support request of $83,166,000 contains $62,600,000 to inactivate the Detroit Army Tank Plant and move the tooling and equipment to the Lima Army Tank Plant.

In light of the Committee's recommendation to keep the M-1 tank facilities operating for the foreseeable future, the Committee denies the $62,600,000 to move tooling out of the Detroit Army Tank Plant.

### WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES

*Grenade launcher, auto, 40 mm MK19-3.*—The Senate-passed authorization bill included the addition of $12,300,000 for 820 MK19-3 grenade launchers. The Committee's recommendation accepts the authorization bill increase.

The Committee directs the Army to use $12,300,000 of the Bradley fighting vehicle contract savings identified by the General Accounting Office to fund this program increase.

*Personal defense weapon, 9 mm.*—The Army's budget request includes $8,021,000 for the procurement of 35,101 personal defense weapons, 9 mm, in fiscal year 1991. The Committee recommends the denial of the fiscal year 1991 request without prejudice, because of production and acceptance delays in the program.

The current backlog of undelivered 9 mm handguns now stands at approximately 231,000 pistols. The Army last accepted pistols in May 1989 before halting deliveries as a result of quality problems. The Army has only accepted 145,000 of the 376,000 9 mm handguns ordered in the original fiscal year 1985 contract.

While the Committee continues to support the 9 mm program, Congress is becoming increasingly frustrated with the producer and the Army's apparent inability to jointly solve these delivery and acceptance problems. The Committee requests that it be kept well informed as to any and all plans to solve these problems and any resumption of handgun deliveries.

### OTHER ISSUES

*Armored gun system [AGS].*—Since the early 1980's, the Army has been trying to replace the M-551 Sheridan light tanks, currently deployed to the 82nd Airborne Division, Fort Bragg, NC. Recent events in Panama and now in the Middle East have further demonstrated the need for a Sheridan replacement.

The Army's current thinking calls for an off-the-shelf nondevelopmental competition to select the best candidate to fulfill the Army's requirements for 70 light assault guns to replace the total Sheridan force. Estimates of total program cost range from $250,000,000 to $300,000,000 for the 70 vehicles.

This Committee is having a very difficult time understanding the justification for the armored gun system [AGS]. The Army states that they need a 105 mm light assault weapon to defeat lightly armored vehicles, trucks, and bunkers. Whereas Army officials acknowledge that there are many weapons in the current Army inventory which will accomplish these exact tasks, they claim they need the protection of the AGS's 105 mm main gun in case soldiers encounter an enemy tank. The Committee questions this logic in light of the marginal capabilities of the 105 mm gun against modern tanks.

One must appreciate that the armored gun system is not envisioned by the Army or this Committee to be a light tank. Within the Committee's summary of the Army's "Research and development" account, this Committee questions the need for the very heavy and very expensive follow-on block III tank and recommends, as a result of recent events, that the Army should begin the development of a true light tank. The AGS is not, and should never be considered, a light tank candidate.

With the revival of the AGS program, the issue of vehicle weight verses crew survivability has many within the Army and Congress taking sides. According to Army officials, the 82nd Airborne Division will not support a light assault vehicle that cannot be air dropped. To be parachuted to the ground, the new system must not weigh more than 35,750 pounds. At this weight, crew protection is currently limited to 7.62 mm. To put this level of protection into perspective, any soldier with a U.S. light antitank weapon [LAW], a weapon that many military and congressional experts claim is marginally effective, could easily defeat the proposed AGS. Any soldier with a .50 caliber machinegun could defeat the AGS. Finally, any soldier with any hand-held heat weapon, which are proliferated in every army in the world, could easily defeat the proposed armored gun system.

The Committee is very concerned with the undefined requirements and specifications for this proposed Army program and the lack of funding support to date. The Committee is reminded of previous and current unsuccessful attempts by the Army to procure off-the-shelf systems without a development effort. To further complicate the issue, a former senior uniformed Army acquisition official has told the Committee that there is not one off-the-shelf candidate for the armored gun system that can be dropped from the air.

If, in fact, there is no current AGS candidate that can meet the fundamental requirement to be air droppable, and the total vehicle requirement remains at only 70 vehicles, the Committee is convinced that the Army should not proceed with their off-the-shelf competition but rather procure the light armored vehicle assault gun [LAV–105], currently in development by the Marine Corps.

The Marine Corps' LAV–105 will integrate a 105 mm cannon with an autoloader into a light armored vehicle [LAV] chassis, provide an M–60A3 tank equivalent stabilized fire control system, and a 7.62 coaxial machinegun. The Marine development contract calls for a gross, combat-loaded weight of not to exceed 30,500 pounds. Within the contract, there is a requirement that the LAV–105 be able to be delivered by low-altitude parachute extraction and low-velocity air dropped via parachute.

A full-scale development contract was awarded in June of this year requiring the delivery of three prototype vehicles in May 1992. Developmental and operational testing will be completed by July 1993 and a production decision is scheduled to be made in January 1994. The Committee has been told that, if required, this schedule could be accelerated by 6 to 12 months depending on the amount of development risk the services are willing to accept.

Until the Army can fully define their operational requirement and system specifications and convince the Committee that Marine Corps LAV-105 cannot meet these objectives, the Committee will not support the appropriations of any fiscal year 1991 funding for the Army's armored gun system program.

## PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $2,011,243,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 1,424,400,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 1,040,459,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,040,459,000 for Army ammunition. This is $383,941,000 below the budget. In addition, the Committee recommends $100,000,000 for Army National Guard ammunition within the "National Guard and Reserve equipment" appropriation.

This appropriation finances the acquisition of ammunition for training and war reserve stocks, modernization and maintenance of equipment and facilities (including construction), and maintenance of inactive ammunition facilities.

### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

The following table details the Committee recommendation in comparison with the budget request:

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

| | Budget | | Committee recommendation | | Senate compared to-- | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Budget amount |
| PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY | | | | | | |
| AMMUNITION | | | | | | |
| SPECIAL AMMUNITION | | | | | | |
| NUCLEAR WEAPONS SUPPORT MATERIEL | -- | 6,350 | -- | 6,350 | --- | -- |
| PROJ, 155MM, BINARY CHEMICAL, M687 GB-2 | -- | 74,303 | -- | --- | -74,303 | -- |
| PRIOR YEAR, BINARY CHEMICAL, M687 | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION | | | | | | |
| CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES | -- | 52,047 | -- | 28,447 | -23,600 | -- |
| CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES | -- | 4,244 | -- | 744 | -3,500 | -- |
| CTG, .45 CAL, ALL TYPES | -- | 495 | -- | 495 | --- | -- |
| CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES | -- | 3,052 | -- | 3,052 | --- | -- |
| CTG, 20MM, LKD TP-T, M220 | -- | 5,458 | -- | 5,458 | --- | -- |
| CTG, 20MM, LKD TP, M55 | -- | 4,405 | -- | 4,405 | --- | -- |
| CTG, 20MM, MPT-SD, M940 | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| CTG, 25MM, AP TRNG, M910 | -- | 25,180 | -- | 25,180 | --- | -- |
| CTG, 25MM, APFSDS-T, M919 | -- | 64,401 | -- | 64,401 | --- | -- |
| CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES | -- | 9,455 | -- | 5,155 | -4,300 | -- |
| CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| M918 TP FOR CEV | -- | 423 | -- | 423 | --- | -- |
| XM922 DUMMY FOR MK19 | -- | 295 | -- | 295 | --- | -- |
| M781 PRACTICE | -- | 890 | -- | 890 | --- | -- |
| M385A1 PRACTICE | -- | 745 | -- | 745 | --- | -- |
| CTG, 40MM HEDP M430 | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MORTAR AMMUNITION | | | | | | |
| CTG, MORTAR, 60MM, SMOKE, M722 | 25 | 4,013 | 25 | 4,013 | --- | -- |
| CTG, MORTAR, 60MM, HE, M720 | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| CTG, MORTAR, 60MM, 1/10 PRAC, M840 | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| CTG, MORTAR, 120MM, HE, XM934 | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| CTG, MORTAR, 120MM, HE, XM933 | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| CTG, MORTAR, 120MM, SMOKE, XM929 | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| CTG, MORTAR, 120MM, ILLUM XM930 | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TANK AMMUNITION | | | | | | |
| CTG, TANK, 35MM, SUBCAL PRAC, M968 | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| CTG, TANK, 105MM, TP-T, M490A1 | 45 | 8,738 | 45 | 8,738 | --- | -- |
| CTG, TANK, 105MM, DS-TP, M724A1 | 34 | 6,511 | -- | --- | -6,511 | -34 |
| CTG, TANK, 105MM, APFSDS-T, M900E1 | 44 | 66,991 | 44 | 66,991 | --- | -- |
| CTG, TANK, 120MM, TP-T, M831 | 43 | 41,158 | 43 | 41,158 | --- | -- |
| CTG, TANK, 120MM, TPCSDS-T, M865 | 177 | 130,458 | 177 | 130,458 | --- | -- |
| ARTILLERY AMMUNITION | | | | | | |
| CTG, ARTY, 75MM, BLANK, M337A1 | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| CTG, ARTILLERY, 105MM, BLANK, M395 | 181 | 5,740 | -- | --- | -5,740 | -181 |
| CTG, ARTILLERY, 105MM, HERA, M913 | 34 | 15,646 | 17 | 8,000 | -7,646 | -17 |
| PROJ, ARTY, 155MM, SMOKE WP, M825 | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| PROJ, ARTY, 155MM, ADAM-S M731 | 8 | 36,928 | -- | --- | -36,928 | -8 |
| PROJ, ARTY, 155MM, RAAMS-S M741 | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| PROJ, ARTY, 155MM, BASEBURNER M864 | 138 | 118,514 | 35 | 30,000 | -88,514 | -103 |
| PROJ, ARTY, 155MM, DPICM, M483A1 | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| PROJ, ARTILLERY, 155MM, TRNG, M804 | 203 | 32,557 | -- | --- | -32,557 | -203 |
| PROJ. ARTY. 155MM, HE M107 | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| PROP CHG, 155MM, GREEN BAG, M3 | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| PROP CHG, 155MM, RED BAG, M203 | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| PROP CHG, 155MM, RED BAG, M119 | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| ARTILLERY FUZES | | | | | | |
| FUZE, ARTILLERY, ELEC TIME, M767 | 35 | 3,098 | 35 | 3,098 | --- | -- |
| FUZE, ARTILLERY, PROXIMITY, M732 | 197 | 33,020 | 197 | 33,020 | --- | -- |
| FUZE, ARTILLERY, PD, M739 | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| FUZE, ARTILLERY, ELEC TIME, M762 | 100 | 7,246 | 100 | 7,246 | --- | -- |
| FUZE, ARTILLERY, MECH-TIME, M577 | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| FUZE, ARTILLERY, MOUT | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MINES | | | | | | |
| MINE, TRAINING, ALL TYPES | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MINE, VOLCANO, PRACTICE, M88 | 3 | 1,621 | 3 | 1,621 | --- | -- |
| MINE, VOLCANO, AT/AP, M87 | 48 | 78,506 | 48 | 78,506 | --- | -- |
| MINE, CLEARING CHARGE, ALL TYPES | -- | 1,589 | 1,400 | 19,789 | +13,200 | +1,400 |
| MINE, MICLIC, ROCKET MOTOR, MK22 | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MINE, MICLIC, LINE CHARGE, M58 | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| ROCKETS | | | | | | |
| RANGER, ANTI-ARMOR WPN SYS (SOF) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| AT-4 MULTI-PURPOSE WEAPON | 11 | 16,642 | -- | --- | -16,642 | -11 |
| ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ILLUM, M257 | -- | 7,497 | -- | 7,497 | --- | -- |
| ROCKET, HYDRA 70, SMOKE, M264 | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| ROCKET, HYDRA 70, MPSM PRAC, M267 | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| ROCKET, HYDRA 70, HE/PD, M151/M423 | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| ROCKET, HYDRA 70, SIG PRAC, M274 | -- | 35,990 | -- | 21,190 | -14,800 | -- |
| OTHER AMMUNITION | | | | | | |
| CTG, 165MM, COMB ENG VEH, TP, M623 | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES | -- | 5,621 | -- | 2,821 | -2,800 | -- |
| GRENADES, ALL TYPES | -- | 7,961 | -- | 1,361 | -6,600 | -- |
| SIGNALS, ALL TYPES | -- | 2,718 | -- | 1,318 | -1,400 | -- |
| SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES | -- | 10,197 | -- | 3,597 | -6,600 | -- |

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

| | Budget | | Committee recommendation | | Senate compared to-- | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Budget amount |
| MISCELLANEOUS | | | | | | |
| AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES | -- | 27,814 | -- | 27,814 | -- | --- |
| CAD/PAD, ALL TYPES | -- | 8,103 | -- | 8,103 | -- | --- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2 MILLION | -- | 4,181 | -- | 2,781 | -- | -1,400 |
| EOD EXPLOSIVE ITEMS | -- | 1,104 | -- | 1,104 | -- | --- |
| SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | -- | --- | -- | --- | -- | --- |
| AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT | -- | 6,000 | -- | 6,000 | -- | --- |
| NITROGUANIDINE | -- | 28,789 | -- | 28,789 | -- | --- |
| AMMO 9WW/ELT | -- | --- | -- | --- | -- | --- |
| HOST NATION SUPPORT (AMMO) | -- | 18,621 | -- | 18,621 | -- | --- |
| CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | -- | 140,004 | -- | 140,004 | -- | --- |
| TOTAL, AMMUNITION | | 1,165,319 | | 849,678 | | -315,641 |
| AMMUNITION PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT | | | | | | |
| PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT | | | | | | |
| PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | -- | 134,647 | -- | 84,647 | -- | -50,000 |
| COMPONENTS FOR PROVE-OUT | -- | 12,100 | -- | 12,100 | -- | --- |
| LAYAWAY OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | -- | 40,534 | -- | 22,234 | -- | -18,300 |
| PROVING GROUND MODERNIZATION | -- | 4,000 | -- | 4,000 | -- | --- |
| MAINTENANCE OF INACTIVE FACILITIES | -- | 67,800 | -- | 67,800 | -- | --- |
| TOTAL, AMMUNITION PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT | | 259,081 | | 190,781 | | -68,300 |
| GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT CONSOLIDATION | -- | --- | -- | --- | -- | --- |
| TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY | | 1,424,400 | | 1,040,459 | | -383,941 |

## INVENTORY REQUIREMENT COMPUTATIONS

The Committee's fiscal year 1990 report requested the Army to provide inventory holdings and requirements, expressed in days of supply, along with the fiscal year 1991 budget justification. After receiving the fiscal year 1991 budget, the Committee learned that the inventory computations did not take into account force structure reductions called for in the budget. The Army informed the Committee that such recomputations would not be made until the fiscal year 1992 budget is submitted.

The Committee is disappointed that the inventory objectives accompanying the fiscal year 1991 budget are overstated and days of supply and sustainability are understated. The current information provided by the Army is based on ammunition requirements for tanks, howitzers, and other weapons that will no longer be in the inventory.

The Committee expects that recomputations reflecting updated force structure projections will be submitted expeditiously along with the 1992 budget.

## GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE AMMUNITION REVIEW

The Committee again acknowledges the staff of the General Accounting Office [GAO] for its professionalism and the high quality of its review of fiscal year 1991 ammunition requirements. Many of GAO's findings are reflected in the Committee's recommendations.

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENTS

*Quantities excess to 1991 requirements.*—Based on the General Accounting Office's review of Army ammunition inventories and requirements, the following adjustments are recommended in small- and medium-caliber ammunition, rockets, and other ammunition procurement. These reductions are based on planned procurements that are excess to 1991 requirements, unwarranted increases in procurement leadtimes and procurement delays. It should be noted that these reductions are based on excess inventories for existing force structure, and even less ammunition will be required by fewer Army divisions during the next few years.

| | |
|---|---|
| 5.56 mm cartridges | –$23,600,000 |
| 7.62 mm cartridges | –3,500,000 |
| 30 mm cartridges | –4,300,000 |
| 2.75-inch, hydra 70, rockets | –14,800,000 |
| Demolition munitions | –2,800,000 |
| 9 mm ball cartridges | –1,400,000 |

## ARTILLERY AMMUNITION

*105 mm blank M-395.*—The Committee recommends no funding be provided for the acquisition of 181,000 blank ceremonial cartridges. This represents a reduction of $5,740,000 from the budget request. This ammunition is excess to normal training and saluting requirements and existing inventories are sufficient for several more years.

*105 mm HERA M-913.*—The Committee recommends a reduction of $7,646,000 for the 105 mm high-explosive rocket-assisted [HERA] artillery cartridge. The Committee fully supports this enhanced ammunition, but type classification delays continue to delay procurement schedules for this round.

*155 mm M-864 baseburner.*—The Committee recommends a reduction of $88,514,000 for the M-864 155 mm baseburner round. This round continues to suffer from design problems that have led to type classification delays. For example, during drop tests the baseburner assembly separated. The design solution to the baseburner joint resulted in fractures in ogive joints.

The effect of these changes has been to delay manufacture of funded workload, so that at this time the Army has still not produced rounds funded in fiscal year 1988 and has a backlog of 400,000 rounds.

*155 mm M-687 binary chemical.*—The Committee recommends no funding be provided for production of M-687 binary chemical artillery ammunition. This represents a reduction of $74,303,000 from the budget request. The administration has canceled this program since submission of the budget.

The Committee directs the Army to use fiscal year 1990 appropriations to lay away binary production facilities.

*155 mm M-804.*—Consistent with the adjustment already approved by the Senate, the Committee recommends that no funding be provided for the M-804 training round. The Army has agreed that these projectiles are excess to requirements.

### MINES

*Mine clearing charge.*—The Committee recommends $19,789,000, an increase of $18,200,000, for 1,400 mine line clearing charges [MILC] for war reserve inventories.

### OTHER AMMUNITION

*Changed requirements.*—The budget requests funding for several programs that the Army no longer intends to procure. Recommended adjustments are as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| L-8A3 smoke grenades | −$6,600,000 |
| M-185 signal kits | −1,400,000 |
| M-24 artillery simulators | −6,600,000 |

### ARMY NATIONAL GUARD AMMUNITION

The Committee has included $100,000,000 in National Guard and Reserve equipment for the procurement of ammunition for the Army National Guard as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| CTG, tank, 105 mm DS-TP, M-724 | $23,111,000 |
| CTG, artillery, 155 mm ADAM-S, M-731 | 36,928,000 |
| Prop charge, 155 mm red bag, M-203 | 23,319,000 |
| AT-4, multipurpose weapon | 16,642,000 |

### PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT

*Provision of industrial facilities.*—Consistent with the Senate-passed Defense authorization, the Committee recommends a reduction of $50,000,000 for provision of industrial facilities. The Army should allocate a proportionate share of this reduction to inactive ammunition facilities.

*Layaway of industrial facilities.*—The fiscal year 1991 budget assumed that all funds appropriated in fiscal year 1990 for production of M-483 155 mm artillery projectiles would be deferred and transferred to fund M-1 tank production. Additional funds needed for layaway of the Mississippi Ammunition Plant were, therefore, requested in 1991. Congress, however: (1) disapproved of the deferral; (2) is funding M-1 tanks with 1991 appropriations; and (3) funded layaway requirements for Mississippi with $45,000,000 in the fiscal year 1990 supplemental appropriations bill. Accordingly, the Committee recommends a reduction of $18,300,000.

## OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $3,669,219,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 2,827,500,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 2,117,812,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,117,812,000, a decrease of $709,688,000 below the President's budget.

This appropriation finances the acquisition of: tactical and commercial vehicles including trucks, semitrailers, and trailers of all types to provide mobility to field forces and the Army logistical system; communications and electronics equipment of all types to provide fixed, semifixed, and mobile strategic and tactical communications equipment; and other support equipment such as chemical defensive equipment, tactical bridging equipment, maintenance shop sets, construction equipment, floating and rail equipment, generators and power units, material handling equipment, medical support equipment, special equipment for user testing, and training devices that are not specific to a particular weapon system. In each of these activities, funds are also included for modification of in-service equipment, spares and repair parts, and production base support.

During its review of the other procurement, Army budget request, the Committee found that funds were being requested for fiscal year 1991, when they were not required until fiscal year 1992.

This misalignment of funds and requirements occurred for several reasons: planned contract awards had slipped, development programs suffered problems during testing, and delays in deliveries of previously funded quantities had created production backlogs.

The Committee's recommendations have recognized these program delays and adjusted fiscal year 1991 funding as required. In those cases where all funding is deleted for programs whose prior year deliveries will continue through fiscal year 1991, the Committee does not intend that the programs be considered new starts in fiscal year 1992, nor that they be considered terminations in 1991.

### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

The following table details the Committee recommendations in comparison to the budget request:

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

| | Budget | | Committee recommendation | | Senate compared to-- | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Budget amount |
| OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY | | | | | | |
| TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES | | | | | | |
| TACTICAL VEHICLES | | | | | | |
| TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS | -- | 8,619 | -- | 8,619 | --- | -- |
| SEMITRAILER FB BB/CONT TRANS 22 1/2 T | 956 | 16,146 | 956 | 16,146 | --- | -- |
| SEMITRAILER, TANK, 5000G | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHLD VEH (HMMWV)(MYP) | 8,262 | 252,374 | 2,427 | 70,474 | -181,900 | -5,835 |
| SMALL UNIT SUPPORT VEHICLE (SUSV) | 157 | 27,031 | -- | --- | -27,031 | -157 |
| FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (MYP) | 392 | 56,330 | 392 | 56,330 | --- | -- |
| HEAVY EQUIPMENT TRANSPORTER SYS | -- | 100,727 | -- | 100,727 | --- | -- |
| FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEH (MYP) | 494 | 150,576 | 494 | 150,576 | --- | -- |
| TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915A1 | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP | -- | 4,730 | -- | 4,730 | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (TAC VEH) | -- | 1,563 | -- | 1,563 | --- | -- |
| NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES | | | | | | |
| PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES | 307 | 5,570 | 307 | 5,570 | --- | -- |
| GENERAL PURPOSE VEHICLES | -- | 7,890 | -- | 7,890 | --- | -- |
| SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES | -- | 7,522 | -- | 7,522 | --- | -- |
| SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES | | | | | | |
| TOTAL PACKAGE FIELDING (OPA-1) | -- | 9,250 | -- | 9,250 | --- | -- |
| FIRST DESTINATION TRANS (OPA-1) | -- | 9,250 | -- | 9,250 | --- | -- |
| SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| SERVICE LIFE EXT PROG - MED TRUCKS | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TAC VEH) | -- | 1,035 | -- | 1,035 | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES | | 658,613 | | 449,682 | -208,931 | |
| COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| COMM - JOINT COMMUNICATIONS | | | | | | |
| CLASSIFIED PROJECT 9WW | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM) | -- | 4,500 | -- | 4,500 | --- | -- |
| TRACTOR SEAT | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| COMM - SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS | | | | | | |
| DEFENSE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM | -- | 40,335 | -- | 40,335 | --- | -- |
| GMF CONTROL | 2 | 1,051 | 2 | 1,051 | --- | -- |
| NAVSTAR USER EQUIPMENT | -- | 29,383 | -- | 6,174 | -23,209 | -- |
| MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT) | -- | 9,942 | -- | 9,942 | --- | -- |
| COMM - C3 SYSTEM | | | | | | |
| TRI-TAC EQUIPMENT | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| EUCOM COMMAND CENTERS | -- | 7,395 | -- | --- | -7,395 | -- |
| EUSA-C3I INITIATIVES | -- | 4,403 | -- | 4,403 | --- | -- |
| SECURE CONFERENCING PROJECT | -- | 1,151 | -- | 1,151 | --- | -- |
| SOUTHCOM C3 UPGRADE | -- | 1,056 | -- | --- | -1,056 | -- |
| USAREUR TACTICAL COMD & CONTROL SYS | -- | 5,966 | -- | --- | -5,966 | -- |
| WWMCCS INFORMATION SYSTEM (WIS) | -- | 20,882 | -- | --- | -20,882 | -- |
| COMM - COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS | | | | | | |
| ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (ADDS) | -- | 22,184 | -- | --- | -22,184 | -- |
| MOBILE SUBSCRIBER EQUIP (MSE) | -- | 29,257 | -- | 14,257 | -15,000 | -- |
| SINCGARS FAMILY | -- | 311,325 | -- | 311,325 | --- | -- |
| SMALL UNIT TRANSCEIVER | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| BATTLEFIELD ELEC COEI SYS (BECS) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| SOF COMMUNICATIONS | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| SW ASIA COMM INFRASTRUCTURE | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| EAC COMMUNICATIONS | -- | 24,825 | -- | --- | -24,825 | -- |
| MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (EAC COMM) | -- | 37,679 | -- | --- | -37,679 | -- |
| MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (CMBT COMM) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (CMBT COMM) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| DIGITAL EQUIPMENT (DSCS) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| INTERCONNECT FACILITY (DSCS) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| JAM RESISTANT SECURE COM (JRSC) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| DSCS OPERATIONS CONTROL SYS (DOCS) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MOD IN-SVC EQUIP (DSCS) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| COMM - COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY | | | | | | |
| TSEC - TRUNK ENCRYPTION DEVICES (TED) | -- | 5,300 | -- | 5,300 | --- | -- |
| TSEC/KG-84, DED LOOP ENCRYP DEV | -- | 11,268 | -- | 11,268 | --- | -- |
| TSEC/KGV-11, SECURE MODULE | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TSEC/KY-99, MINTERM | -- | 5,018 | -- | 5,018 | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (COMSEC) | -- | 6,388 | -- | 6,388 | --- | -- |
| TSEC - SEC VOICE IMPRV PROG (COMSEC) | -- | 1,779 | -- | 1,779 | --- | -- |
| COMM - LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS | | | | | | |
| TERRESTRIAL TRANSMISSION | -- | 5,946 | -- | 5,946 | --- | -- |
| TERRESTRIAL TRANSMISSIONS PACOM | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| C-E FACILITIES/PROJECTS | -- | 2,412 | -- | 2,412 | --- | -- |
| DEFENSE DATA NETWORK (DDN) | -- | 2,718 | -- | 2,718 | --- | -- |
| ELECTROMAG COMP PROG (ECMP) | -- | 418 | -- | 418 | --- | -- |
| WW TECH CON IMP PROG (WWTCIP) | -- | 4,186 | -- | 4,186 | --- | -- |
| COMM - BASE COMMUNICATIONS | | | | | | |
| INFORMATION SYSTEMS | -- | 39,658 | -- | 39,658 | --- | -- |
| INFORMATION SYSTEMS (EUCOM) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| INFORMATION SYSTEMS (PACOM) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| INFO SYS-MCA SUPPORT | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| INFORMATION SYSTEMS CONUS/WESTERN HEMISPHE | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

| | Budget Qty. | Budget Amount | Committee recommendation Qty. | Committee recommendation Amount | Senate compared to-- Qty. | Senate compared to-- Budget amount |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| AR TELECOM AUTO PROG (ATCAP)............................ | -- | 2,606 | -- | 2,606 | --- | -- |
| LOCAL AREA NETWORK (LAN)............................ | -- | 3,951 | -- | 3,951 | --- | -- |
| PENTAGON TELECOM CTR (PTC)............................ | -- | 3,453 | -- | 3,453 | --- | -- |
| ELECT EQUIP - NAT FOR INT PROG (NFIP) | | | | | | |
| FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PROG (FCI)................ | -- | 203 | -- | 203 | --- | -- |
| GENERAL DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (GDIP)............ | -- | 29,728 | -- | 28,635 | -1,093 | -- |
| ELECT EQUIP - TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA) | | | | | | |
| ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYS (ASAS) (TIARA)................ | -- | 59,338 | -- | 11,838 | -47,500 | -- |
| COMMANDERS TACTICAL TERMINAL (CTT) (TIARA)............ | 10 | 5,577 | 10 | 5,577 | --- | -- |
| IMAGERY PROCESSING SYSTEM (IPS) (TIARA)................ | -- | 8,625 | -- | 8,625 | --- | -- |
| TAC ELEC SURV SYS (TESS) (TIARA)........................ | -- | 3,949 | -- | 3,949 | --- | -- |
| TROJAN (TIARA)............................ | -- | 4,581 | -- | 4,581 | --- | -- |
| 4TH PSYOP GROUP............................ | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| STARNET/VIABLE............................ | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| AMC INFORMATION PROCESSING EQUIP (IPE)................ | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| ACQN INFORMATION MANAGEMENT............................ | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| HQ AUTOMATION............................ | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MEDICAL AUTOMATION SYSTEMS............................ | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| PERSONNEL AUTOMATION SYSTEMS............................ | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TRAINING AUTOMATION SYSTEMS............................ | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| LOGISTICS AUTOMATION SYSTEMS............................ | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (TIARA)................ | -- | 14,426 | -- | 14,426 | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (INTEL SPT)............................ | -- | 6,066 | -- | 6,066 | --- | -- |
| ELECT EQUIP - ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) | | | | | | |
| TACTICAL DECEPTION DEVICE (TAC-D)............................ | -- | 526 | -- | 526 | --- | -- |
| MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (EW)............................ | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV) | | | | | | |
| TRACTOR CRASH............................ | -- | 2,136 | -- | 2,136 | --- | -- |
| NIGHT VISION DEVICES............................ | -- | 62,185 | -- | 62,185 | --- | -- |
| PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS............................ | -- | 11,777 | -- | 11,777 | --- | -- |
| RADIATION MONITORING SYSTEMS............................ | -- | 18,838 | -- | 18,838 | --- | -- |
| MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SURV)............................ | -- | 16,582 | -- | 16,582 | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (TAC SURV)............................ | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS | | | | | | |
| CMBT SVC SUPT CONTROL SYS (CSSCS)............................ | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| CORPS/THEATER ADP SVC CTR (CTASC)............................ | -- | 13,177 | -- | 9,677 | -3,500 | -- |
| FORWARD ENTRY DEVICE (FED)............................ | -- | 19,749 | -- | --- | -19,749 | -- |
| LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS)............................ | -- | 523 | -- | 523 | --- | -- |
| LOGTECH............................ | -- | 8,336 | -- | 8,336 | --- | -- |
| MANUEVER CONTROL SYS (MCS)............................ | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TACTICAL ARMY CSS COMPUTER SYS (TACCS)............................ | -- | 15,733 | -- | --- | -15,733 | -- |
| ARMY RESERVES HQ INFO SYSTEMS............................ | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TRACTOR BALL............................ | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| ELECT EQUIP - AUTOMATION | | | | | | |
| AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP............................ | -- | 64,763 | -- | 45,495 | -19,268 | -- |
| ELECT EQUIP - AUDIO VISUAL SYS (A/V) | | | | | | |
| AFRTS............................ | -- | 6,593 | -- | 6,593 | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (A/V)............................ | -- | 2,093 | -- | 2,093 | --- | -- |
| ELECT EQUIP-TEST MEAS&DIAG EQUIP (TMDE) | | | | | | |
| CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT............................ | -- | 13,564 | -- | 13,564 | --- | -- |
| CORE ELECTRONIC AUTO TEST (STE-X)............................ | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIP (IFTE)................ | -- | 33,587 | -- | 33,587 | --- | -- |
| TMDE MODERNIZATION (TMOD)............................ | -- | 18,562 | -- | 18,562 | --- | -- |
| ELECT EQUIP - SUPPORT | | | | | | |
| SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS............................ | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| ARMY PRINTING AND BINDING EQUIPMENT............................ | -- | 3,575 | -- | 3,575 | --- | -- |
| PECIP AND ORIP............................ | -- | 15,612 | -- | 15,612 | --- | -- |
| PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E)............................ | -- | 12,682 | -- | 12,682 | --- | -- |
| FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (C-E)............................ | -- | 41,484 | -- | 41,484 | --- | -- |
| MILSTAR REDUCTION............................ | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| SPECIAL PROGRAMS............................ | -- | 139,662 | -- | --- | -139,662 | -- |
| TOTAL, COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT..... | | 1,300,667 | | 895,966 | -404,701 | |
| OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| COMPUTER/INDICATOR, CP-696/PD............................ | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| FACILITY INTRUSION DETECTION SYSTEM............................ | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| AIMING LIGHT, INFRARED, AN/PAQ-4............................ | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| NIGHT VISION SIGHT INDIV WPN AN/PVS-4............................ | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| RADIAC SET AN/VDR-2............................ | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MULTIFUNCTION RADAR TRANSPONDER BEACON............................ | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| DECONTAMINATE APP PWR DR LT WT M17............................ | 472 | 7,110 | 472 | 7,110 | --- | -- |
| MASK, PROTECTIVE, NBC............................ | -- | 5,000 | -- | 5,000 | --- | -- |
| MASK, ACFT............................ | 10,600 | 23,332 | 10,600 | 23,332 | --- | -- |
| CHEMICAL AGENT MONITOR............................ | 3,178 | 20,187 | 3,178 | 20,187 | --- | -- |
| SIMP COLL PROT EQUIP M20............................ | 257 | 2,461 | 257 | 2,461 | --- | -- |
| COLL PROT EQUIP, NBC TEMPER, XM28............................ | -- | 4,354 | -- | 4,354 | --- | -- |
| RECON SYSTEM, NBC............................ | 15 | 36,914 | 15 | 40,414 | +3,500 | -- |
| BRIDGING EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| LIGHT ASSAULT BRIDGE............................ | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M(BRIDGING)............................ | -- | 590 | -- | 590 | --- | -- |

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

| | Budget | | Committee recommendation | | Senate compared to-- | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Budget amount |
| ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| DISPENSER, MINE XM139 | 20 | 5,626 | 20 | 5,626 | --- | -- |
| VEHICLE MAGNETIC SIGNATURE DUP | 53 | 4,620 | 53 | 4,620 | --- | -- |
| M-9 ARMORED COMBAT EARTHMOVER (ACE) | 132 | 59,852 | 35 | 15,952 | -43,900 | -97 |
| MOD IN-SVC EQ (ENGR-NC) | -- | 1,915 | -- | 1,915 | --- | -- |
| COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| AIR CONDITIONERS VARIOUS SIZE/CAPACITY | -- | 2,969 | -- | 2,969 | --- | -- |
| FIELD KITCHEN,MOBILE, TRL MTD | 413 | 6,600 | 413 | 6,600 | --- | -- |
| RIGID WALL SHELTER CMD POST ANNEX | -- | 11,381 | -- | 11,381 | --- | -- |
| DIVING EQUIPMENT | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| LAUNDRY UNIT/TRL MTD | 40 | 4,900 | 40 | 4,900 | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (CSS-EQ) | -- | 3,366 | -- | 3,366 | --- | -- |
| MOD IN-SVC EQUIP (CSE) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| SOF ITEMS LESS THAN 2.0M (CSS-EQ) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| TANK ASSEMBLY FAB COLL POL 50000 G | 78 | 1,000 | 78 | 1,000 | --- | -- |
| TANK ASSEMBLY FAB COLLAPSIBLE POL 10000G | 119 | 1,054 | 119 | 1,054 | --- | -- |
| TANK ASSY, FAB COLLAPS, 20,000 GAL POL | 537 | 3,265 | 537 | 3,265 | --- | -- |
| TANK/PUMP UNIT LIQ DISP F/TRK MOUNTING | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| LABORATORY, PETROLEUM, SEMI-TRLR MTD | 6 | 3,775 | 6 | 3,775 | --- | -- |
| PUMP ASSY LIQ GAS WHL 4 IN OUT 350 GPM | 454 | 4,541 | 454 | 4,541 | --- | -- |
| SWA PETROLEUM DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM | -- | 56,156 | -- | 56,156 | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (POL) | -- | 1,969 | -- | 1,969 | --- | -- |
| WATER EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| WATER PURIF UNIT REV OS 3000 GPH | 36 | 14,300 | 36 | 14,300 | --- | -- |
| TANK FABRIC COLL WTR 3000 GAL (ONION) | 606 | 1,000 | 606 | 1,000 | --- | -- |
| WATER QUALITY ANALYSIS SET PURIF | 100 | 909 | 100 | 989 | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (WATER EQ) | -- | 2,606 | -- | 2,606 | --- | -- |
| MEDICAL EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL | -- | 60,320 | -- | 60,320 | --- | -- |
| MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 72,428 | -- | 72,428 | --- | -- |
| MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| WELDING SHOP, TRAILER MTD | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (MAINT EQ) | -- | 7,684 | -- | 7,684 | --- | -- |
| CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| SMALL EMPLACEMENT EXCAVATOR (SEE) | 5 | 1,511 | 5 | 1,511 | --- | -- |
| MOD IN-SVC EQ (CONST EQUIP) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (CONST EQUIP) | -- | 3,365 | -- | 3,365 | --- | -- |
| RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| TUG INLAND AND COASTAL WATERWAYS | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MOD IN-SVC EQ (FLOAT/RAIL) | -- | 3,620 | -- | 3,620 | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (FLOAT/RAIL) | -- | 2,345 | -- | 2,345 | --- | -- |
| GENERATORS | | | | | | |
| GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP | -- | 45,821 | -- | 45,821 | --- | -- |
| MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| TRUCK, FORK LIFT, DE, PT, RT, 6000 LB | 255 | 20,034 | 255 | 20,034 | --- | -- |
| TRUCK, FORK LIFT, DE, PT, RT, 4000 LB | 376 | 18,152 | 376 | 18,152 | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (MHE) | -- | 4,573 | -- | 4,573 | --- | -- |
| TOTAL PACKAGE FIELDING (OPA-3) | -- | 10,758 | -- | --- | -10,758 | -- |
| FIRST DESTINATION TRANS (OPA-3) | -- | 10,758 | -- | 10,758 | --- | -- |
| SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| BASE LEVEL COM'L EQUIPMENT | -- | 16,254 | -- | 16,254 | --- | -- |
| PROD ENHANCING CAPITAL INVEST PROG | -- | 4,948 | -- | 4,948 | --- | -- |
| QUICK RETURN ON INVESTMENT PROGRAM | -- | 2,573 | -- | 2,573 | --- | -- |
| PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH) | -- | 10,578 | -- | 10,578 | --- | -- |
| OSD PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENT FUNDING | -- | 34,375 | -- | 34,375 | --- | -- |
| INDUSTRIAL MODERNIZATION INCENTIVE PROG | -- | 3,506 | -- | 3,506 | --- | -- |
| SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING | -- | 12,690 | -- | 12,690 | --- | -- |
| HOST NATION SUPPORT - EUROPE | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS SUPPORT | -- | 15,791 | -- | 15,791 | --- | -- |
| TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM | -- | 101,423 | -- | 101,423 | --- | -- |
| SIMNET/CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MODERNIZATION OF EQUIPMENT - O & M TRANSFER | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| INSTALLATION OF MODERNIZATION EQUIPMENT | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| AREA ORIENTED DEPOT UPGRADE | -- | 30,481 | -- | 30,481 | --- | -- |
| IND/DEPOT MAINT EQUIP | -- | 82,400 | -- | 37,502 | -44,898 | -- |
| CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 868,220 | | 772,164 | -96,056 | |
| TITLE X - NATIONAL TRAINING CENTER | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| REDUCTION FOR FORCE STRUCTURE ADJUSTMENTS | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT CONSOLIDATION | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION (MSE) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY | | 2,827,500 | | 2,117,812 | -709,688 | |

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENTS

### TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES

*High mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicles [HMMWV].*—The Committee recommends the transfer of $181,900,000 requested for reserve component units into the "National Guard and Reserve equipment, defense" account.

### COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT

*Army tactical command and control system [ATCCS].*—The Army's tactical command and control system consists of five command and control and three communications systems. ATCCS is designed to enhance warfighting capabilities against a Warsaw Pact threat by automating battlefield command and control and improving communications at corps level and below.

The Committee is very concerned with the Army's approach to developing and deploying ATCCS as an integrated system of systems. Because the ATCCS component systems were initiated as individual systems, each is overseen separately. Three of the component systems have received independent oversight from the Defense Acquisition Board, while the other two are overseen by the Army System Acquisition Review Council.

In June 1990, the Army acquisition executive restructured one of the component command and control systems to emphasize light divisions. However, the other four component systems were not evaluated for similar changes at the same time, increasing the risk for additional changes in the future.

At the request of this Committee, the General Accounting Office [GAO] reviewed the status of the ATCCS program. GAO found that the Army has not yet fully defined how the component systems will operate as a system of systems; and that independent oversight, focusing on delays and functional shortfalls in any system, would reduce the risk that the eight systems may not be able to be integrated as a total system without costly redesign and retrofitting. GAO also reported that the ATCCS system would benefit from Defense Acquisition Board review and oversight as a major defense acquisition program to assure that ATCCS works as an integrated system of systems.

The Army estimates the acquisition cost for the five ATCCS battlefield command and control systems and three communications systems at over $20,000,000,000, which clearly exceeds the $1,000,000,000 threshold for review as a major defense acquisition program. As a result of the GAO report, the Committee directs the Army to present ATCCS, as a system of systems, to the Defense Acquisition Board [DAB] for review as a major defense acquisition program. In addition, the Committee directs the Army not to obligate any appropriated funds for ATCCS component or communications systems until the DAB reviews and publishes an acquisition decision memorandum for the integrated ATCCS program. Accordingly, the Committee directs that no fiscal year 1991 funds be appropriated for the following ATCCS component systems:

*USAREUR tactical command and control system [UTACCS].*—UTACCS is a theater specific, echelon above corps application of the Army tactical command and control system. UTACCS is designed to provide commanders with force status, logistics, and intelligence information to support United States and allied forces in Europe. It is intended to facilitate the peacetime and wartime coordination of force movement and replacement, host nation support, casualty reporting, weather, and other functions. As a result of the concerns discussed above, the Committee recommends the reduction of $5,966,000, the amount requested for fiscal year 1991 funding, until ATCCS is reviewed as a major defense acquisition program.

*All-Source analysis system.*—The Committee accepts the authorization committee reduction of $47,500,000, which is consistent with this Committee's interest in realigning the ATCCS program as a major defense acquisition program.

*Mobile subscriber equipment.*—Mobile subscriber equipment is a new generation of tactical communications, providing telephone-like service to corps, divisions, and separate brigades. The program is one of the three ATCCS communications systems. The General Accounting Office has identified $15,000,000 in fiscal year 1990 contract savings due to revised economic price adjustments to the basic contract. The Committee has applied these savings to offset the funds requested for fiscal year 1991 and recommends the appropriation of $14,257,000.

Further, the Committee directs the Army not to obligate any prior year appropriated funds for the purchase of ATCCS interface packet switches until the ATCCS program is reviewed by the Defense Acquisition Board as a major defense acquisition program.

*Army data distribution system [ADDS].*—ADDS is intended to provide the Army with a near-real-time, jam-resistant, secure data distribution capability within corps and divisions. ADDS consists of two separate systems—the enhanced position location reporting system [EPLRS] and the joint tactical information distribution system [JTIDS]. EPLRS provides information on friendly troop locations and is primarily for forward area air defense and field artillery units. The Army plans to use JTIDS to provide high-rate data communications to Hawk and Patriot air defense units and other high-rate data users and to interoperate with the Air Force and Allied forces. Consistent with the discussion above, the Committee recommends the deletion of the $22,184,000 requested for operational testing and evaluation in fiscal year 1991 until ATCCS has been reviewed by the Defense Acquisition Board as a major defense acquisition program.

*Corps/theater ADP service center [CTASC].*—The Army budget request included $13,200,000 to provide computer information processing services and communications in the combat service support units at corps and Echelons above corps. CTASC interfaces and operates with ATCCS. The Committee recommends the reduction of $3,500,000 from the budget request, and the appropriation of $9,677,000 for fiscal year 1991. The General Accounting Office found that the computers and peripheral equipment to be procured with these funds are the same as, or functionally compatible with, excess ATCCS systems that are currently being stored until the Army can find a use for them. Therefore, the Committee directs the Army to use excess ATCCS equipment to satisfy the CTASC computer requirements.

*Forward entry device.*—The forward entry device is a field component of the advanced field artillery tactical data system [AFATDS], one of the five command and control subsystems of ATCCS. The Army is currently revising AFATDS requirements and fiscal year 1990 funds remain unobligated. The Committee recommends the deletion of $19,749,000 and directs the Army not to obligate fiscal year 1990 funds until ATCCS has been reviewed by the Defense Acquisition Board as a major defense acquisition program.

*Tactical Army combat service support computer system [TACSSCS].*—TACSSCS is an ATCCS subsystem which supports personnel, supply, maintenance, medical, ammunition, and transportation applications at various levels of command down to battalion. Consistent with the discussion above, the Committee does not support continued fielding of ATCCS subsystems until the entire program is reviewed by the Defense Acquisition Board as a major defense acquisition program. Therefore, the Committee recommends that the $15,733,000 requested for fiscal year 1991 be denied.

### COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT

*Navstar user equipment.*—The Navstar global positioning system [GPS] is a space-based radio navigation system. It is designed to provide precise, continuous, all-weather, global positioning navigation data for military and civil users. The Army's budget request includes $29,383,000 to continue procurement of Navstar GPS 1-channel and 5-channel receiver sets. Congress appropriated $17,021,000 for Navstar user equipment in fiscal year 1990, based on an anticipated full-rate production decision for 5-channel sets in July 1990. The full-rate production decision has been postponed indefinitely due to poor test results and the fiscal year 1990 funds remain unobligated. The Committee recommends a reduction of $23,209,000 in fiscal year 1991, providing $6,174,000 for the procurement of small, lightweight GPS receivers to support light forces under low rates of initial production. The full-rate production decision for one-channel sets is scheduled for the second quarter of fiscal year 1991.

*Eucom Command Center.*—The Army's budget request includes $7,395,000 to upgrade the United States European Command, Command Center complex in Germany. Given the changes that have occurred in Europe, the Committee does not believe continued enhancement of a system designed to provide information on the current political-military situation in Europe is necessary, and recommends the deletion of the budget request pending Army review of its command and control requirements for the European theater.

*Southcom* $C^3$ upgrade.—The Committee supports funding for this program in the "Drug Interdiction" section of this report.

*Worldwide military command and control system.*—The Committee recommends that funding requested for fiscal year 1991, $20,882,000, be deferred. The WWMCCS program is discussed at length in the "Other Procurement, Air Force" section of this report.

*EAC communications.*—The Army requested $24,825,000 to procure echelons above corps communications, formerly known as Tri-Tac. As discussed previously in this section, the Committee is very concerned about the Army's plans for automated tactical command and control systems and changing battlefield requirements. In addition, $11,000,000 of the $13,000,000 appropriated by Congress in fiscal year 1990 was rescinded in the Fiscal Year 1990 Supplemental Act, further impacting upon program execution. Accordingly, the Committee provides no funding for this program in fiscal year 1991, and directs the Army to restructure the EAC program and provide its revised acquisition strategy with its fiscal year 1992 budget submission.

*Modification of in-service equipment (EAC).*—The Committee recommends the deletion of $37,679,000 requested for a fiscal year 1991 product improvement plan for EAC communications. Because the Committee has directed the Army to restructure the EAC program, the Committee has postponed the product improvement plan until the Army presents its revised acquisition strategy with its fiscal year 1992 budget submission.

*General Defense Intelligence Program.*—The Committee's recommendation for this program is discussed in the classified annex of this report.

*Automated data processing equipment [ADPE].*—The following Army ADPE reductions are discussed at length in the "Corporate Information Management" section of this report.

| | |
|---|---|
| Army standard information system | −$1,886,000 |
| Financial management automation | −9,104,000 |
| AMC information processing equipment | −8,278,000 |
| Total | −19,268,000 |

*Special programs.*—The Committee's recommendation for this program is discussed in the classified annex of this report.

## OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT

*Reconnaissance system NBC.*—The nuclear, biological, chemical reconnaissance system [NBCRS] is sampling, detection and warning equipment integrated into a high speed, high mobility, armored carrier capable of performing NBC reconnaissance on primary, secondary, and cross-country routes wherever combat, combat support, and combat service support forces are deployed.

The German Government has recently announced a donation of 60 NBCRS to the United States in support of the Desert Shield Operation. The U.S. Army will accept 50 systems and the Air Force has indicated a desire for the other 10 systems. Included with the systems are all German NBCRS specific spare parts and repair parts, both initial and sustaining, labor costs to Americanize the systems and training of DOD personnel.

The United States Army has now identified a requirement to sustain training of the soldiers trained by the Germans and to train replacement crews. Since the German commitment is to train only the initial crews, the United States Army Chemical School must establish a training course immediately to allow continued training at Fort McClellan, AL.

The Committee, therefore, recommends an additional appropriation of $3,500,000 for the procurement of nuclear, biological, chemical reconnaissance system [NBCS] simulators for immediate deployment to the U.S. Army Chemical School at Fort McClellan, AL.

*M-9 armored combat earthmover.*—The Committee accepts the authorization committee reduction of $43,900,000 based on projected force structure reductions and lower inventory objectives.

*Total package fielding.*—The Army's appropriation budget request included $10,758,000 for total package fielding, a new administrative and logistics support funding line. The Committee recommends costs for this effort be funded from individual programs, as has been customary, and denies fiscal year 1991 funding.

*Industrial/depot maintenance equipment.*—The Army's request included $82,400,000 for replacement and modernization equipment for the Army's industrially funded installations. The Committee is very concerned that this appropriation item is becoming a wish list for unjustified and unspecified projects which have not been reviewed by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Production and Logistics or the OSD Comptroller. Based on its review of the materials submitted by the Army, the Committee found that the request for equipment (less than $1,000,000) tripled from the fiscal year 1990 level, with a 250-percent increase in unspecified equipment (less than $250,000). The Committee also found an unjustified 500-percent increase in ADP equipment, over 50 percent of which is for depot systems command ADP equipment. The Committee does not support expansion of depot level ADP systems at the same time the Deputy Secretary of Defense has ordered the DOD-wide consolidation of depot operations. The Committee's support for computer-aided acquisition and logistics support-related systems is discussed in the "Corporate Information Management" section of this report. In addition, $7,100,000 of the fiscal year 1991 request was requested for projects scheduled for Army depots proposed for closure by the Secretary of Defense. The Committee does not support continued modernization at these locations until the future of the facilities is determined. Therefore, the Committee recommends a reduction of $44,898,000 from the request and the appropriation of $37,502,000 for fiscal year 1991.

## OTHER ADJUSTMENTS

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget request | Committee recommendation | Change from budget |
|---|---|---|---|
| Small unit support vehicle | 27,031 | | −27,031 |

## Aircraft Procurement, Navy

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $9,389,266,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 9,838,600,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 7,343,737,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $7,343,737,000, a decrease of $2,494,863,000 from the President's budget request.

This appropriation finances the construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft, including ordnance systems, ground support equipment, flight simulators, spare parts, accessories, and specialized equipment; and expansion of public and private plants.

### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

The Committee recommended funding for naval aviation programs represents a significant reduction from the amount requested in the President's budget. The specific recommendations are consistent with reductions assumed in the Senate-passed authorization bill for the A-12, CH-53E, F/A-18 aircraft, and the Airborne Self-Protection Jammer Program. Additional adjustments are recommended in several aviation programs, resulting from program delays and diminished requirements. The specific recommendations are listed in the table which follows and discussed in succeeding paragraphs.

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

| | Budget | | Committee recommendation | | Senate compared to-- | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Budget amount |
| AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY | | | | | | |
| COMBAT AIRCRAFT | | | | | | |
| BA-1 COMBAT AIRCRAFT | | | | | | |
| EA-6B/REMFG (ELECTRONIC WARFARE) PROWLER | 3 | 303,324 | 3 | 303,324 | -- | --- |
| EA-6B/REMFG (ELECTRONIC WARFARE) PROWLER (AP-CY) | -- | 46,649 | -- | 46,649 | -- | --- |
| AV-8B (V/STOL)HARRIER (MYP) | 24 | 457,286 | 24 | 440,286 | -- | -17,000 |
| AV-8B (V/STOL)HARRIER (MYP) (AP-CY) | -- | --- | -- | --- | -- | --- |
| F-14A/D/REMFG (FIGHTER) TOMCAT | 12 | 779,946 | 12 | 780,946 | -- | +1,000 |
| F-14A/D/REMFG (FIGHTER) TOMCAT (AP-CY) | -- | 126,290 | -- | 126,290 | -- | --- |
| F/A-18 (FIGHTER) HORNET | 66 | 1,894,123 | 42 | 1,309,523 | -24 | -584,600 |
| F/A-18 (FIGHTER) HORNET (AP-CY) | -- | 150,832 | -- | 96,032 | -- | -54,800 |
| CH/MH-53E (HELCOPTER) SUPER STALLION | 23 | 376,915 | -- | --- | -23 | -376,915 |
| CH/MH-53E (HELCOPTER) SUPER STALLION (AP-CY) | -- | 57,845 | -- | --- | -- | -57,845 |
| V-22 OSPREY (AP-CY) | -- | --- | -- | --- | -- | --- |
| SH-60B (ASW HELICOPTER) SEAHAWK (MYP) | 6 | 104,077 | 6 | 104,077 | -- | --- |
| SH-60B (ASW HELICOPTER) SEAHAWK (MYP) (AP-CY) | -- | 40,326 | -- | 40,326 | -- | --- |
| SH-60F CV (ASW HELICOPTER) (MYP) | 18 | 232,523 | 18 | 232,523 | -- | --- |
| SH-60F CV (ASW HELICOPTER) (MYP) (AP-CY) | -- | 39,625 | -- | 39,625 | -- | --- |
| P-7A (PATROL) LRAACA | -- | 20,537 | -- | --- | -- | -20,537 |
| E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE | 6 | 350,914 | 6 | 350,914 | -- | --- |
| E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE (AP-CY) | -- | 38,113 | -- | 38,113 | -- | --- |
| AIRBORNE SELF PROTECTION JAMMER | -- | --- | -- | --- | -- | --- |
| AH-1W (ATTACK HELO) COBRA | -- | --- | -- | --- | -- | --- |
| HH-60H (AP-CY) | -- | --- | -- | --- | -- | --- |
| TOTAL, COMBAT AIRCRAFT | | 5,019,325 | | 3,908,628 | | -1,110,697 |
| TRAINER AIRCRAFT | | | | | | |
| BA-3 TRAINER AIRCRAFT | | | | | | |
| T-44A | -- | --- | -- | --- | -- | --- |
| T-45TS (TRAINER) GOSHAWK | 12 | 261,000 | -- | 91,400 | -12 | -169,600 |
| T-45TS (TRAINER) GOSHAWK (AP-CY) | -- | 44,939 | -- | 44,939 | -- | --- |
| TOTAL, TRAINER AIRCRAFT | | 305,939 | | 136,339 | | -169,600 |
| MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT | | | | | | |
| BA-5 MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT | | | | | | |
| A-3 SERIES | -- | 102 | -- | --- | -- | -102 |
| A-4 SERIES | -- | 7,407 | -- | 7,407 | -- | --- |
| A-6 SERIES | -- | 84,093 | -- | 84,093 | -- | --- |
| EA-6 SERIES | -- | 50,634 | -- | 50,634 | -- | --- |
| A-7 SERIES | -- | 102 | -- | 102 | -- | --- |
| AV-8 SERIES | -- | 401 | -- | 401 | -- | --- |
| F-4 SERIES | -- | 102 | -- | 102 | -- | --- |
| RF-4 SERIES | -- | 102 | -- | 102 | -- | --- |
| F-14 SERIES | -- | 72,388 | -- | 72,388 | -- | --- |
| F-5 SERIES | -- | 102 | -- | 102 | -- | --- |
| ES-3 SERIES | -- | 5,163 | -- | 5,163 | -- | --- |
| OV-10 SERIES | -- | 1,340 | -- | 1,340 | -- | --- |
| F-18 SERIES | -- | 19,568 | -- | 19,568 | -- | --- |
| H-46 SERIES | -- | 39,492 | -- | 39,492 | -- | --- |
| H-53 SERIES | -- | 35,694 | -- | 35,694 | -- | --- |
| SH-60 SERIES | -- | 45,079 | -- | 45,079 | -- | --- |
| VH-60 SERIES | -- | --- | -- | --- | -- | --- |
| H-1 SERIES | -- | 78,902 | -- | 78,902 | -- | --- |
| H-2 SERIES | -- | 8,932 | -- | 8,932 | -- | --- |
| H-3 SERIES | -- | 1,343 | -- | 1,343 | -- | --- |
| EP-3 SERIES | -- | 22,423 | -- | --- | -- | -22,423 |
| P-3 SERIES | -- | 248,191 | -- | 173,735 | -- | -74,456 |
| S-3 SERIES | -- | 112,939 | -- | 112,939 | -- | --- |
| E-2 SERIES | -- | 119,467 | -- | 119,467 | -- | --- |
| TRAINER A/C SERIES | -- | 23,404 | -- | 23,404 | -- | --- |
| C-130 SERIES | -- | 7,952 | -- | 7,952 | -- | --- |
| FEWSG | -- | 5,464 | -- | 5,464 | -- | --- |
| CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES | -- | 6,373 | -- | 6,373 | -- | --- |
| E-6 SERIES | -- | 8,185 | -- | 8,185 | -- | --- |
| POWER PLANT CHANGES | -- | 11,606 | -- | 11,606 | -- | --- |
| MISC FLIGHT SAFETY CHANGES | -- | 27 | -- | 27 | -- | --- |
| COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT | -- | 102,798 | -- | 102,798 | -- | --- |
| COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES | -- | 15,269 | -- | 15,269 | -- | --- |
| MODERNIZATION OF EQUIPMENT, O&M TRANSFER | -- | --- | -- | --- | -- | --- |
| INSTALLATION OF MODERNIZATION EQUIPMENT | -- | --- | -- | --- | -- | --- |
| TOTAL, MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT | | 1,135,044 | | 1,038,063 | | -96,981 |
| AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | | | | | |
| SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | -- | 1,288,542 | -- | 1,126,116 | -- | -162,426 |
| AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPEMENT AND FACILITIES | | | | | | |
| BA-7 AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FAC | | | | | | |
| COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT | -- | 434,304 | -- | 434,304 | -- | --- |
| AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | -- | 36,034 | -- | 30,034 | -- | -6,000 |
| WAR CONSUMABLES | -- | 30,718 | -- | 30.718 | -- | --- |

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

| | Budget | | Committee recommendation | | Senate compared to-- | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Budget amount | |
| OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES | -- | 33,592 | -- | 33,592 | | --- | -- |
| SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 47,243 | -- | 47,243 | | --- | -- |
| FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION | -- | 6,000 | -- | 6,000 | | --- | -- |
| RETIREMENT OF OBSOLETE AIRCRAFT | -- | --- | -- | -39,300 | | -39,300 | -- |
| CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | -- | 1,501,859 | -- | 592,000 | | -909,859 | -- |
| TOTAL, AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPEMENT AND FACILITIES | | 2,089,750 | | 1,134,591 | | -955,159 | |
| GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT CONSOLIDATION | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| GENERAL INCREASE - (DESERT SHIELD) | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY | | 9,838,600 | | 7,343,737 | | -2,494,863 | |

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENTS

*A-12.*—The Committee's recommendations concerning the A-12 program are discussed in the report accompanying the classified annex.

*F-14D.*—The Committee recoomends an increase of $10,000,000 for the F-14D program for fatigue testing. Offsetting this amount is a decrease of $9,000,000 for ASPJ production as discussed below.

*F/A-18 Hornet.*—The Committee recommends $1,309,523,000 for the purchase of 42 F/A-18 fighter/attack aircraft, a reduction of 24 aircraft and $584,600,000. The recommendation is based on assumed force structure reductions and is consistent with Senate authorization. An additional $54,800,000 is reduced from advance funding based on reductions in future production rates.

*Airborne self-protection jammer.*—The Committee recommendation reduces funding for F/A-18, F-14, AV-8B, and spare parts for production of ASPJ units. Last year, after receiving poor test results on the ASPJ, the Congress instructed the Defense Department not to procure any additional ASPJ units until operational testing had demonstrated that previously identified shortcomings had been fixed. Congress noted that purchases could continue if failure to do so would jeopardize program suppliers. The Defense inspector general reviewed this matter and determined that the vendor base is not jeopardized. No additional operational testing has been scheduled to be completed during fiscal year 1991. Therefore, the Committee recommendation eliminates all production funds for ASPJ. Amounts for nonrecurring and support costs remain in the reduced levels. The Committee also requests that all ASPJ and related funding be clearly identified in future budget requests.

*CH-53E Super Stallion helicopters.*—The Committee recommends no funding for purchase of CH-53E helicopters pending the outcome of the V-22 program. The President's budget requests $376,915,000 to procure 23 CH-53E helicopters in lieu of V-22 purchases. The Committee understands that this matter is again under review. In view of this uncertainty, the Committee does not believe it is prudent to recommend funding for the CH-53E.

The Committee notes that the recent reports including that of the Institute for Defense Analysis question the cost effectiveness of proceeding with the CH-53E and CH-60 helicopters as an alternative to V-22. While the data is not conclusive, the Committee believes it would be appropriate for the Defense Department to reexamine the V-22 decision. In its review, the Defense Department should consider other options, specifically the purchase of a marinized CH-47 in lieu of either the V-22 or a mix of CH-53E and CH-60 helicopters.

*CH-53E advance procurement.*—The Committee recommends no funding for CH-53E advance procurement in view of the uncertainty in this program.

*V-22 advance procurement.*—The Committee recommends a transfer of $200,000,000 from fiscal year 1989 funds to continue research and development on the V-22 Osprey aircraft. This recommendation is consistent with direction contained in the Senate authorization bill.

*P-7A LRAACA advance procurement.*—The Committee recommends no funding for the P-7A aircraft noting the recent termination of the program by the Navy.

*T-45 Goshawk training system.*—The Committee recommends $91,400,000 for the T-45 training system. This amount is $169,600,000 below the budget request. The T-45 Goshawk is a derivative of the Hawk aircraft, modified for training Navy carrier pilots. The aircraft has experienced delays due to serious design deficiencies which are greater than originally anticipated. Last year, the Defense Department and Congress recognized this problem and deferred further procurement. The Committee understands that carrier suitability of the T-45 aircraft will not be determined until testing has been completed in late fiscal year 1991. Therefore, the Committee recommends no funding for purchase of aircraft. The funding recommended will continue to provide nonrecurring and other support costs for the T-45 training system.

The Committee is concerned that the Navy intends to adhere to its original schedule for procuring training simulators. However, it is not clear that the simulators will accommodate the as yet undetermined design characteristics of the aircraft. The Committee believes the Navy should not proceed with any simulator purchases until the final aircraft configuration has been approved by the Defense Department and the aircraft has successfully completed flight testing.

*P-3C Orion modifications.*—The budget requests $248,191,000 for modification of the P-3C aircraft. Of this amount, $68,316,000 is requested for the new avionics suite on the aircraft, called Update IV. The Committee understands that the Update IV system is experiencing delays, and therefore, recommends no funds for this program. An additional $6,140,000 is reduced for a classified program consistent with Senate authorization.

*Spare and repair parts.*—The Committee recommends $1,126,116,000 for purchase of spare and repair parts for Navy aircraft. This amount is $162,426,000 below the budget request. The reductions are related to the adjustments recommended for obsolete aircraft and in the A-12, F/A-18, CH-53E, P-3C, and ASPJ programs.

*Other authorized adjustments.*—The Committee has included the following adjustments which are consistent with recommendations assumed in the Senate authorization bill.

[In thousands of dollars]

| Program | Request | Recommended | Adjustment |
|---|---|---|---|
| A-3 mods | 102 | | −102 |
| EP-3 mods | 22,423 | | −22,423 |
| Obsolete aircraft | | −39,300 | −39,300 |
| Industrial facilities | 36,034 | 30,034 | −6,000 |
| Classified | | | −909,859 |

## WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $5,392,312,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 6,161,400,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 5,892,242,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $5,892,242,000, a decrease of $269,158,000 below the President's request.

This appropriation finances the construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of strategic and tactical missiles, torpedoes, other weapons, and related support equipment, including spare parts and accessories, and the expansion of public and private plants.

### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

The following table details the Committee recommendation in comparison to the budget request:

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

| | Budget | | Committee recommendation | | Senate compared to-- | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Budget amount |
| WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY | | | | | | |
| BALLISTIC MISSILES | | | | | | |
| TRIDENT I | -- | 1,252 | -- | 1,252 | --- | -- |
| TRIDENT II | 52 | 1,343,780 | 52 | 1,343,780 | --- | -- |
| TRIDENT II (AP-CY) | -- | 192,565 | -- | 192,565 | --- | -- |
| SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES | | | | | | |
| MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | -- | 2,404 | -- | 2,404 | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, BALLISTIC MISSILES | | 1,540,001 | | 1,540,001 | --- | |
| OTHER MISSILES | | | | | | |
| STRATEGIC MISSILES | | | | | | |
| TOMAHAWK | 600 | 808,733 | 400 | 662,500 | -146,233 | -200 |
| TACTICAL MISSILES | | | | | | |
| AMRAAM | 550 | 421,916 | 300 | 297,000 | -124,916 | -250 |
| PHOENIX | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| SLAM | 215 | 241,086 | 215 | 241,086 | --- | -- |
| HARM | 1,320 | 339,382 | 1,320 | 284,582 | -54,800 | -- |
| STANDARD MISSILES | 900 | 607,762 | 900 | 607,762 | --- | -- |
| RAM | 405 | 70,383 | 405 | 70,383 | --- | -- |
| HELLFIRE | 1,198 | 42,076 | 1,198 | 42,076 | --- | -- |
| PENGUIN | 65 | 44,150 | 65 | 44,150 | --- | -- |
| PENGUIN (AP-CY) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MAVERICK MISSILES | -- | 5,794 | -- | 5,794 | --- | -- |
| MAVERICK MISSILES (MYP) (AP-CY) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| AERIAL TARGETS | -- | 142,421 | -- | 167,421 | +25,000 | -- |
| DRONES AND DECOYS | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT | -- | 29,110 | -- | 29,110 | --- | -- |
| MODIFICATION OF MISSILES | | | | | | |
| TOMAHAWK MODS | -- | 26,726 | -- | 26,726 | --- | -- |
| SPARROW MODS | -- | 30,009 | -- | 30,009 | --- | -- |
| SIDEWINDER MODS | -- | 7,076 | -- | --- | -7,076 | -- |
| PHOENIX MODS | -- | 3,809 | -- | 76,809 | +73,000 | -- |
| HARPOON MODS | -- | 18,263 | -- | 18,263 | --- | -- |
| STANDARD MISSILES MODS | -- | 15,447 | -- | 15,447 | --- | -- |
| INSTALLATION OF MODERNIZATION EQUIPMENT | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES | | | | | | |
| WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | -- | 24,986 | -- | 38,086 | +13,100 | -- |
| FLEET SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (MYP) | 3 | 249,599 | 3 | 249,599 | --- | -- |
| FLEET SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (MYP) (AP-CY) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 95,524 | -- | 95,524 | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, OTHER MISSILES | | 3,224,252 | | 3,002,327 | -221,925 | |
| TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| MK-48 ADCAP TORPEDO | 240 | 350,291 | 240 | 350,291 | --- | -- |
| SEA LANCE | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MK-50 ALWT | 265 | 328,266 | 265 | 328,266 | --- | -- |
| ASW TARGETS | -- | 26,409 | -- | 26,409 | --- | -- |
| ASROC | -- | 20,156 | -- | 20,156 | --- | -- |
| MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP | | | | | | |
| MK-46 TORPEDO MODS | -- | 11,740 | -- | 11,740 | --- | -- |
| QUICKSTRIKE MINE | -- | 16,096 | -- | 16,096 | --- | -- |
| SWIMMER WEAPONS SYSTEM-(SOF) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 55,278 | -- | 55,278 | --- | -- |
| ASW RANGE SUPPORT | -- | 24,382 | -- | 24,382 | --- | -- |
| LOGISTIC SUPPORT | | | | | | |
| FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION | -- | 8,700 | -- | 8,700 | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT | | 841,318 | | 841,318 | --- | |
| OTHER WEAPONS | | | | | | |
| GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS | | | | | | |
| MK-15 PHALANX CIWS | 17 | 61,958 | 17 | 61,958 | --- | -- |
| MK-75 76MM GUN MOUNT | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MK-19 40MM MACHINE GUN | 25 | 538 | 25 | 538 | --- | -- |
| MK-38 25MM GUN MOUNT | 55 | 9,609 | 55 | 9,609 | --- | -- |
| SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS | -- | 12,604 | -- | 12,604 | --- | -- |
| SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS-(SOF) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS | | | | | | |
| CIWS MODS | -- | 81,292 | -- | 81,292 | --- | -- |
| 5/54 GUN MOUNT MODS | -- | 17,611 | -- | 17,611 | --- | -- |
| 3/50 GUN MOUNT MODS | -- | 885 | -- | 885 | --- | -- |
| MK-75 76MM GUN MOUNT MODS | -- | 9,985 | -- | 9,985 | --- | -- |
| MODS UNDER $2 MILLION | -- | 2,401 | -- | 2,401 | --- | -- |

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

| | Budget | | Committee recommendation | | Senate compared to-- | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Budget amount | |
| SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | | | | | | |
| GUN SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 5,263 | -- | 5,263 | | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, OTHER WEAPONS | | 202,146 | | 202,146 | | --- | |
| OTHER ORDNANCE | | | | | | | |
| AIR LAUNCHED ORDNANCE | | | | | | | |
| GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS | -- | 48,018 | -- | 48,018 | | --- | -- |
| 2.75 INCH ROCKETS | -- | 14,644 | -- | 14,644 | | --- | -- |
| MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION | -- | 12,450 | -- | 12,450 | | --- | -- |
| PRACTICE BOMBS | -- | 38,039 | -- | 32,739 | | -5,300 | -- |
| BIGEYE CHEMICAL WEAPON | -- | 8,911 | -- | --- | | -8,911 | -- |
| SHIP ORDNANCE | | | | | | | |
| 3 INCH/50 GUN AMMUNITION | -- | 469 | -- | 469 | | --- | -- |
| 5 INCH/38 GUN AMMUNITION | -- | 4,386 | -- | 4,386 | | --- | -- |
| 5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION | -- | 11,925 | -- | 11,925 | | --- | -- |
| 16 INCH GUN AMMUNITION | -- | 33,022 | -- | --- | | -33,022 | -- |
| CIWS AMMUNITION | -- | 32,815 | -- | 32,815 | | --- | -- |
| 76MM GUN AMMUNITION | -- | 1,060 | -- | 1,060 | | --- | -- |
| OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION | -- | 32,935 | -- | 32,935 | | --- | -- |
| SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMUNITION | -- | 33,935 | -- | 33,935 | | --- | -- |
| PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION | -- | 2,565 | -- | 2,565 | | --- | -- |
| SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | -- | 78,509 | -- | 78,509 | | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, OTHER ORDNANCE | | 353,683 | | 306,450 | | -47,233 | |
| GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT CONSOLIDATION | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY | | 6,161,400 | | 5,892,242 | | -269,158 | |

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENTS

### OTHER MISSILES

### STRATEGIC MISSILES

*Tomahawk missile.*—The Navy requested $808,733,000 for the procurement of 600 Tomahawk missiles in fiscal year 1991. This is a rate increase of 200 missiles more than the fiscal year 1990 production level.

The Tomahawk is a cruise missile developed as a long-range land attack or antiship weapon with a conventional or nuclear warhead. It has been designed to be launched from submarines, surface ships, aircraft, and land platforms.

According to Navy budget documentation, fiscal year 1991 and 1992 were the final procurement years of the Tomahawk system, having met the inventory objectives of the program after 1992. However, the Navy now desires to change this procurement strategy in order to continue production of the Tomahawk system beyond fiscal year 1992 by slowing the annual rates in 1991 and 1992. The Committee supports this strategy for several reasons.

By slowing the production rates and increasing the years of procurement, the industrial base will benefit from a more gradual slowdown in the program. By continuing the Tomahawk production rate at the fiscal year 1990 levels, competition is preserved and stability in the program is maintained. Further, as the world situation becomes more clear, the Department will be better able to estimate total inventory requirements and the need for a potential block upgrade to the Tomahawk missile system.

The Committee, therefore, recommends a reduction of $146,233,000 and 200 missiles from the Navy's fiscal year 1991 request.

### TACTICAL MISSILES

*AMRAAM missile.*—Within the fiscal year 1991 budget request the Navy has included $421,916,000 for the procurement of 550 advanced medium-range air-to-air missiles [AMRAAM]. Because of continued developmental problems, the Committee recommends maintaining AMRAAM missile production at low rate until flight test problems have been resolved.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $297,000,000 for the procurement of 300 missiles for the Navy in fiscal year 1991.

*HARM missile.*—The Department of the Navy has requested $339,382,000 for the procurement of 1,320 AGM–88B/C high-speed antiradiation missiles [HARM] in fiscal year 1991.

The HARM is a joint Navy and Air Force air-to-surface missile designed to suppress or destroy land-based and sea-based radars supporting enemy air defense systems. Initial procurement of the HARM missile began in fiscal year 1981. In an attempt to lower the missile unit price, the Navy has brought on a second source producer to compete with the prime contractor by building a new guidance package known as the low-cost seeker [LCS].

The General Accounting Office [GAO] has reported to the Committee that the second source has fallen so far behind in deliveries of prior-year missiles that there will be no need for a fiscal year 1991 contract award for the low-cost seeker. Because of these delays, the GAO has recommended a reduction of $54,800,000 from the HARM's fiscal year 1991 budget.

The Committee agrees with the General Accounting Office's recommendation and provides $284,582,000 for as many HARM missiles as the Navy can buy in fiscal year 1991.

*Aerial targets.*—The Navy's budget request contains $142,421,000 for the procurement of aerial targets in fiscal year 1991.

The Committee recommends the addition of $25,000,000 for the procurement of tactical air-launched decoys [TALD] for use by the fleet as a low-cost aerial target.

### MODIFICATION OF MISSILES

*Phoenix missile.*—The Department of Defense has notified Congress of its intent to terminate the Phoenix missile [AIM–54C] procurement program after the fiscal year 1990 production contract is completed. There is no funding request for the Phoenix missile in the fiscal year 1991 budget request.

The current Phoenix missile remains the most capable long-range air-to-air missile in the U.S. inventory. It is the only missile having intercept capability against targets above 70,000 feet and has the longest launch range of any air-to-air missile. The Navy plans to replace the Phoenix missile with the advanced air-to-air missile [AAAM] system now in development. However, the AAAM is behind schedule and there are continued concerns about cost growth and affordability of the system. The time between the proposed end of Phoenix missile production and the fielding of the first AAAM continues to widen as problems surface in the AAAM's full-scale development program.

While the Committee agrees that it is a prudent risk to end the production of new Phoenix missiles in view of the current world environment, the Committee is concerned that as the ECM threat continues to improve over the next decade, the existing Phoenix missile will become less capable. However, the Navy has already invested more than $65,000,000 for the development of a block modification to the current AIM-54C which is expected to match improvements in the threat over the next decade. The Committee believes that the delays in the AAAM program justify proceeding with a Phoenix modification program.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $73,000,000 in fiscal year 1991 to begin a modification and retrofit program for the Phoenix missile. Further, the Committee supports delaying the delivery of 180 Phoenix missiles from the fiscal year 1990 new production contract for delivery during the fiscal year 1991 funded delivery period in the upgraded configuration. Further, beginning in fiscal year 1992, the Committee would further support a retrofit program of 300 missiles per year until such time as all Phoenix missiles have been upgraded or the advanced air-to-air missile [AAAM] system begins production.

*Standoff land attack missile [SLAM].*—In funding fiscal year 1991 production for SLAM, the Committee notes the important role Navy air launched, standoff precision strike weapons can play in Third World crises. The Committee further notes that the funds requested and provided are not likely to produce the 215 missiles indicated and urges the Department and the Navy to continue SLAM production until the stockage requirement is filled.

### SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES

*Weapons industrial facilities.*—The Navy's fiscal year 1991 budget request includes $24,986,000 for the modernization of Navy industrial facilities.

Committee recommends an increase of $13,100,000 to the Navy's fiscal year 1991 request to continue the modernization of the Allegheny Ballistics Laboratory, a Government-owned facility, which produces propulsion units for the Navy.

### OTHER ORDNANCE

*MK-76 practice bombs.*—The Committee recommends a reduction of $5,300,000 for MK-76 practice bombs. As noted by the General Accounting Office, the Navy's budget request overestimated training consumption rates. The Navy budget forecasted that the service would use 50 percent more practice bombs during the fiscal year 1991 delivery period than its highest usage during any fiscal year from 1983 through 1988.

*Bigeye chemical weapon.*—The Committee recommends no funding for the Bigeye chemical weapon. This represents a reduction of $8,911,000 to the budget request. The administration has canceled this program since submission of the budget.

*16-inch gun ammunition.*—Consistent with the Senate-passed Defense authorization, the Committee recommends no new procurement of 16-inch gun ammunition. This represents a reduction of $33,022,000 from the budget request. While the Committee continues to strongly support the deployment and operation of U.S. battleships, a fact-of-life adjustment in ammunition procurement is warranted. The firing practice following the tragic accident aboard the U.S.S. *Iowa* resulted in fiscal year 1990 ammunition consumption falling far below the level anticipated in the 1991 budget request.

### OTHER ADJUSTMENTS

*Sidewinder modifications.*—The Committee agrees with the authorization reduction of $7,100,000 for the Sidewinder [AIM-9] missile modification program.

## SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $11,409,066,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 11,195,200,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 9,313,672,000 |

The Committee recommends $9,313,672,000, a decrease of $1,881,528,000 from the budget request.

### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

The Committee recommendations include funding for 1 ballistic missile submarine, 1 attack submarine, 4 destroyers, 2 amphibious ships, 2 auxiliaries, and 12 landing craft. The programs funded reflect the Senate-passed authorization and the updated plans by the Defense Department for major warships. The major changes are in line with the reduced force structure planned for the Navy. Additional adjustments are based on program delays and other changes unanticipated at the time of the budget submission. The Committee recommendations are listed in the table below and described in the text which follows.

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

| | Budget | | Committee recommendation | | Senate compared to-- | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Budget amount |
| SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY | | | | | | |
| FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE SHIPS | | | | | | |
| BA-1 FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE SHIPS | | | | | | |
| TRIDENT (NUCLEAR) | 1 | 1,244,629 | 1 | 1,331,201 | +86,572 | -- |
| (TRANSFER FROM OTHER ACCOUNTS) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TRIDENT (NUCLEAR) (AP-CY) | -- | 143,000 | -- | --- | -143,000 | -- |
| TRIDENT PRIOR YEAR SAVINGS | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE SHIPS | | 1,387,629 | | 1,331,201 | -56,428 | |
| OTHER WARSHIPS | | | | | | |
| BA-2 OTHER WARSHIPS | | | | | | |
| SSN-688 CLASS SUBMARINE (NUCLEAR) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| SSN-21 | 2 | 2,342,900 | 1 | 1,382,000 | -960,900 | -1 |
| SSN-21 (AP-CY) | -- | 1,139,100 | -- | --- | -1,139,100 | -- |
| CV SLEP | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| CV SLEP (AP-CY) | -- | 113,068 | -- | 113,068 | --- | -- |
| ENTERPRISE REFUELING/MODERNIZATION | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| DDG-51 (MYP) | 5 | 3,566,403 | 4 | 3,109,403 | -457,000 | -1 |
| DDG-51 (MYP) (AP-CY) | -- | 3,600 | -- | 3,600 | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, OTHER WARSHIPS | | 7,165,071 | | 4,608,071 | -2,557,000 | |
| AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS | | | | | | |
| BA-3 AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS | | | | | | |
| LHD-1 AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT SHIP (MYP) | 1 | 959,800 | 1 | 959,800 | --- | -- |
| LHD-1 AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT SHIP (MYP) (AP-CY) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| LSD-41 (CARGO VARIANT) | 1 | 240,000 | 1 | 240,000 | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS | | 1,199,800 | | 1,199,800 | --- | |
| MINE WARFARE AND PATROL SHIPS | | | | | | |
| BA-4 MINE WARFARE + PATROL SHIPS | | | | | | |
| MCM MINE COUNTERMEASURES SHIP | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MHC MINE HUNTER COASTAL | 3 | 268,100 | -- | --- | -268,100 | -3 |
| TOTAL, MINE WARFARE AND PATROL SHIPS | | 268,100 | | --- | -268,100 | |
| AUXILIARIES, CRAFT, AND PRIOR-YEAR PROGR | | | | | | |
| BA-5 AUXILIARIES, CRAFT + PY PROG COSTS | | | | | | |
| AO (JUMBO) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TAGOS SURTASS SHIPS | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| AOE | 1 | 398,200 | 1 | 398,200 | --- | -- |
| OCEANOGRAPHIC SHIPS | 1 | 43,100 | 1 | 43,100 | --- | -- |
| MOORED TRAINING SHIP DEMONSTRATION | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| SERVICE CRAFT | -- | 27,300 | -- | 27,300 | --- | -- |
| LANDING CRAFT | -- | 10,400 | -- | 10,400 | --- | -- |
| LCAC LANDING CRAFT (MYP) | 12 | 244,700 | 12 | 244,700 | --- | -- |
| LCAC LANDING CRAFT (MYP) (AP-CY) | -- | 23,200 | -- | 23,200 | --- | -- |
| SEALIFT | -- | --- | -- | 1,000,000 | +1,000,000 | -- |
| PATROL BOATS (SOF) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| OUTFITTING | -- | 231,100 | -- | 231,100 | --- | -- |
| POST DELIVERY | -- | 154,500 | -- | 154,500 | --- | -- |
| USCG ICEBREAKERS | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION | -- | 5,800 | -- | 5,800 | --- | -- |
| SHIP SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 36,300 | -- | 36,300 | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, AUXILIARIES, CRAFT, AND PRIOR-YEAR PROGR | | 1,174,600 | | 2,174,600 | +1,000,000 | |
| SEQUESTRATION REDUCTION | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY | | 11,195,200 | | 9,313,672 | -1,881,528 | |
| TRANSFER FROM OTHER ACCOUNTS | | --- | | --- | --- | |
| TOTAL FUNDING AVAILABLE | | 11,195,200 | | 9,313,672 | -1,881,528 | |

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENTS

*Trident.*—The Committee recommends $1,331,201,000 for procurement of one Trident submarine. The amount recommended is $199,640,000 above the amount requested. A reduction of $4,660,000 is made because of the cancellation of the BQS-24 sonar system. An increase of $91,233,000 is provided to offset partially the cost of terminating the Trident Program after purchase of this submarine.

*Trident advance procurement.*—The budget requested $143,000,000 in advance funding to support the procurement of additional Trident submarines in fiscal years 1992 and 1993. Last year, the Committee expressed concern that proceeding with additional Trident construction may not be consistent with our strategic arms control objectives. The Committee again raises this concern and recommends no funding for advance procurement for the Trident program. This recommendation is consistent with levels agreed to in Senate authorization.

*SSN-21 Seawolf.*—The Committee recommends $1,382,000,000 for purchase of one SSN-21 class nuclear attack submarine. The Major Warship Review, completed this summer, recommends one SSN-21 be funded in fiscal year 1991. The allowance represents a reduction of $960,900,000 from the amount requested. It incorporates a decrease of $75,000,000 from the Navy's most recent estimate for one SSN-21 submarine, reducing funds for plans. The initial request for plans in 1989 for the fiscal year 1991 program for two submarines was $70,000,000. The budget request this year increased the cost to $180,000,000. The latest estimate is $245,000,000 for one SSN-21. The Committee believes the 350-percent increase is excessive, and therefore, makes the reduction.

The Committee recommends no funding for advance procurement for the SSN-21 program instead of $1,139,100,000 as requested for advance funding for future requirements. The first SSN-21 submarine was appropriated in fiscal year 1989 and is only 5-percent completed. The Senate has authorized no funds for advance procurement to allow more construction to be accomplished on the first submarine before proceeding with additional purchases. The Committee concurs with this recommendation.

The Committee is concerned that the recent decision resulting from the major warship review to curtail the overall production rate of the SSN-21 program may be inconsistent with the Navy's current plan to establish a second source. Therefore, the Committee directs that the contract for the next SSN-21 be competed. In addition, the Committee directs the Navy to reassess its current strategy to ascertain and adopt the most cost-effective plan.

*Carrier service life extension program [CV-SLEP].*—The budget requests $113,068,000 for advance procurement to begin planning for a service life extension of the U.S.S. *Kennedy.* The SLEP program was designed to add an additional 15 years' service to vessels at the end of their 30-year service life. The cost of a SLEP is estimated to be about one-quarter of the cost of procuring a new aircraft carrier.

The Committee has supported the SLEP program as a cost-effective alternative to additional carrier procurement as the Navy sought to increase its force structure to 15 deployable carrier battlegroups. However, in view of the force structure projected for the Defense Department, the Committee understands the Defense Department is considering reducing its carrier forces from the current 14 to a lower number.

Secretary Cheney testified that reduced carrier forces could obivate the need to continue the CV–SLEP program. Furthermore, the Committee understands the Navy is now considering a plan to perform an overhaul of the *Kennedy* instead of a service life extension, although this contradicts the current budget request. As such, the Committee has provided the amount requested, but has limited obligations until the Secretary of Defense reports to the Committee, in conjunction with the fiscal year 1992 budget submission, the Navy's plans for the *Kennedy*. In the event the Secretary reports that the Navy no longer plans to perform the SLEP, the Committee has included bill language which would transfer the funds to the Trident program, for costs associated with closing down that production line, or to other procurement, Navy for costs associated with undertaking the overhaul on the *Kennedy*. The Committee fully expects the 6-year defense plan to include funding for a complex overhaul to be performed on the *Kennedy* in the event a service life extension is not to be undertaken.

In view of the changing threat assessments and new force projection requirements for the Navy, the Committee requests that in its report the Secretary of Defense shall provide details with respect to the Navy's near- and long-term plans for the size of the carrier fleet.

The Committee also requests that the report include the following: (a) a plan for performing a complex overhaul [COH] of the *Kennedy* if a decision is made not to undertake a SLEP; (b) 10-year plan for new aircraft carrier procurement; (c) 10-year plan for existing carrier deactivation; (d) cost-effectiveness analyses of performing a SLEP on the *Kennedy* versus funding new nuclear aircraft procurement; (e) role of the carrier fleet in satisfying current and projected national security requirements; (f) near- and long-term threat assessments; and (g) cost-effectiveness analyses of performing a SLEP on the *Kennedy* versus performing a COH.

The Committee understands the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard has the lowest man/day rate of all the Navy shipyards and has substantial experience in carrier repair and overhaul having performed SLEP's on five different carriers. Further, the Committee understands that the Navy intends to perform a complex overhual on the *Kennedy* at the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard. Accordingly, if a decision is made to discontinue the SLEP program, the Committee requests that the Navy consider utilizing the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard for the complex overhaul of the *Kennedy* and future east coast conventional carrier complex overhauls to be undertaken.

*DDG–51 Aegis destroyer.*—The major warship review conducted by the Defense Department has reduced the planned annual and total purchases of DDG–51 Aegis destroyers. Commensurate with this decision, the Committee recommends a reduction of $457,000,000 and one destroyer from the budget request. The Committee notes that the amount reduced is significantly lower than $713,280,600 per ship requested in the budget. The Committee understands that the lower production rate is anticipated to increase unit prices, but believes the adjusted price is approaching an unacceptable level. The Committee is informing the Defense Department that it is unlikely to approve additional funds for this procurement and recommends that the Navy consider reducing the number of DDG's if the recommended amount is insufficient to procure four ships.

*Coastal minehunter [MHC].*—The Committee recommends no funds for purchase of MHC ships in fiscal year 1991 instead of $268,100,000 requested for three ships. The MHC program has experienced delays and higher costs than anticipated at the time of the budget submission. Due to these factors and the unique construction process of the MHC, it is unlikely that sufficient progress will be made on prior ships to warrant funding additional ships during this fiscal year. The Committee wants to reiterate its support for mine warfare programs, but believes a fly-before-buy approach would be appropriate in this program.

*Sealift.*—The Committee recommends an increase of $1,000,000,000 above the budget request for sealift. The early results of Operation Desert Shield demonstrate that a serious flaw in our Nation's defense posture is sealift. The Committee notes that this deficiency was not unanticipated by the Congress which provided $600,000,000 in fiscal year 1990 for this program. To date, the Defense Department has been unwilling to take steps to redress this shortfall.

The Committee believes the Defense Department should use the funds provided for the construction of ships for maritime prepositioning [MPS] for Army equipment. It is understood that the funding recommended would be sufficient to provide for at least one additional squadron of MPS ships. Considering that the MPS ships demonstrated their utility in the recent operation, the Committee believes additional ships of this type could provide a much needed capability to deploy equipment rapidly. Furthermore, as equipment is withdrawn from overseas locations, the Committee believes the military departments should examine storing this equipment on prepositioned ships instead of retiring or otherwise disposing of it.

The Committee continues to believe the $375,000,000 in sealift funds provided in fiscal year 1990 should be used for the construction of fast sealift vessels, to augment the existing SL-7 fleet or for the purchase of additional MPS ships to augment existing squadrons.

Furthermore, the Committee recommends that all ships constructed using the aforementioned sealift funds should be designed to meet commercial specifications as defined by the American Bureau of Shipping and Coast Guard regulations.

## OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $7,895,461,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 6,081,500,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 5,811,675,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $5,811,675,000, a decrease of $269,825,000 below the President's budget.

This appropriation finances the procurement of major equipment and weapons other than ships, aircraft, missiles, torpedoes, and guns. Equipments range from the latest electronic sensors for updating of naval forces to trucks, training equipment, and spare parts.

### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

The following table details the Committee recommendations in comparison to the amended budget request.

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

|  | Budget |  | Committee recommendation |  | Senate compared to-- |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Budget amount |
| OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LM-2500 GAS TURBINE | -- | 6,425 | -- | 6,425 | --- | -- |
| ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE | 1 | 6,357 | 1 | 6,357 | --- | -- |
| STEAM PROPULSION IMPROVEMENT | -- | 5,285 | -- | 5,285 | --- | -- |
| OTHER PROPULSION EQUIPMENT | -- | 7,840 | -- | 7,840 | --- | -- |
| GENERATORS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OTHER GENERATORS | -- | 11,197 | -- | 11,197 | --- | -- |
| PUMPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OTHER PUMPS | -- | 4,736 | -- | 4,736 | --- | -- |
| AIR COMPRESSORS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HIGH PRESSURE AIR COMPRESSORS | 2 | 2,040 | 2 | 2,040 | --- | -- |
| PROPELLERS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SUBMARINE PROPELLERS | 16 | 5,759 | 16 | 5,759 | --- | -- |
| OTHER PROPELLERS AND SHAFTS | -- | 4,005 | -- | 4,005 | --- | -- |
| NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ELEC SUSPENDED GYRO NAVIGATOR | -- | 3,651 | -- | 3,651 | --- | -- |
| OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT | -- | 8,341 | -- | 8,341 | --- | -- |
| UNDERWAY REPLENISH EQUIP |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT | -- | 11,214 | -- | 11,214 | --- | -- |
| PERISCOPES |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TYPE 18 PERISCOPES | -- | 8,890 | -- | 8,890 | --- | -- |
| PERISCOPES AND ACCESSORIES | -- | 4,171 | -- | 4,171 | --- | -- |
| OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT | -- | 59,268 | -- | 59,268 | --- | -- |
| COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD | 5 | 8,345 | 5 | 8,345 | --- | -- |
| POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT | -- | 28,611 | -- | 28,611 | --- | -- |
| SUBMARINE SILENCING EQUIPMENT | -- | 14,122 | -- | 14,122 | --- | -- |
| SURFACE SHIP SILENCING EQUIPMENT | -- | 6,660 | -- | 6,660 | --- | -- |
| SUBMARINE BATTERIES | 9 | 2,991 | 9 | 2,991 | --- | -- |
| STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 58,395 | -- | 58,395 | --- | -- |
| SWS SHIPBOARD SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| DSSP EQUIPMENT | -- | 12,022 | -- | 12,022 | --- | -- |
| SEALIFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 21,944 | -- | 21,944 | --- | -- |
| AIR CONDITIONERS | -- | 794 | -- | 794 | --- | -- |
| MINESWEEPING EQUIPMENT | -- | 6,168 | -- | 6,168 | --- | -- |
| HM&E ITEMS UNDER $2 MILLION | -- | 33,751 | -- | 33,751 | --- | -- |
| SURFACE IMA | -- | 9,380 | -- | 9,380 | --- | -- |
| DEGAUSSING EQUIPMENT | -- | 715 | -- | 715 | --- | -- |
| RADIOLOGICAL CONTROLS | -- | 529 | -- | 529 | --- | -- |
| MINI/MICROMINI ELECTRONIC REPAIR | -- | 654 | -- | 654 | --- | -- |
| CHEMICAL WARFARE DETECTORS | 1,153 | 13,854 | 1,153 | 13,854 | --- | -- |
| SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM | 3 | 2,182 | 3 | 2,182 | --- | -- |
| MOLDED CASE CIRCUIT BREAKERS | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| REACTOR POWER UNITS | 1 | 46,767 | 1 | 46,767 | --- | -- |
| REACTOR COMPONENTS | -- | 303,417 | -- | 303,417 | --- | -- |
| OCEAN ENGINEERING |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT | -- | 4,163 | -- | 4,163 | --- | -- |
| NAVAL SPECIAL WARFARE EQUIPMENT | -- | 2,141 | -- | 2,141 | --- | -- |
| NAVAL SPECIAL WARFARE EQUIPMENT-(SOF) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| SMALL BOATS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SMALL BOATS | 101 | 10,419 | 101 | 10,419 | --- | -- |
| TRAINING EQUIPMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT | -- | 7,390 | -- | 7,390 | --- | -- |
| PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PRODUCTION SUPPORT FACILITIES | -- | 9,900 | -- | 9,900 | --- | -- |
| OPERATING FORCES IPE | -- | 10,347 | -- | 10,347 | --- | -- |
| INSTALLATION OF MODERNIZATION EQUIPMENT | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| INSTALLATION OF PRIOR YEAR EQUIPMENT | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| OTHER SHIP SUPPORT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS | -- | 129,336 | -- | 129,336 | --- | -- |
| MODERNIZATION SUPPORT | -- | 444,779 | -- | 444,779 | --- | -- |
| REDUCTION, REDUCED FORCES | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| REDUCTION, EXCESS REPROGRAMMING | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT |  | 1,338,955 |  | 1,338,955 | --- |  |
| COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SHIP RADARS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AN/SPS-40 | -- | 32,666 | -- | 32,666 | --- | -- |
| AN/SPS-48 | -- | 1,007 | -- | 1,007 | --- | -- |
| AN/SPS-49 | -- | 8,523 | -- | 8,523 | --- | -- |

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

| | Budget | | Committee recommendation | | Senate compared to-- | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Budget amount | |
| AN/SYS-() | -- | 4,849 | -- | 4,849 | | --- | -- |
| MK-23 TARGET ACQUISITION SYSTEM | 4 | 37,531 | 4 | 37,531 | | --- | -- |
| RADAR SUPPORT | -- | 12,707 | -- | 12,707 | | --- | -- |
| SHIP SONARS | | | | | | | |
| SURFACE SONAR SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 18,443 | -- | 18,443 | | --- | -- |
| AN/SQQ-89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM | -- | 280,192 | -- | 280,192 | | --- | -- |
| AN/BQQ-5 | -- | 127,259 | -- | 127,259 | | --- | -- |
| SURFACE SONAR WINDOWS AND DOME | -- | 10,988 | -- | 10,988 | | --- | -- |
| SONAR SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 6,574 | -- | 6,574 | | --- | -- |
| SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS | -- | 25,920 | -- | 25,920 | | --- | -- |
| FBM SYSTEM SONARS | -- | 3,004 | -- | 3,004 | | --- | -- |
| ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT | | | | | | | |
| SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM | -- | 27,384 | -- | 27,384 | | --- | -- |
| SSTD | -- | 17,500 | -- | 17,500 | | --- | -- |
| ACOUSTIC COMMUNICATIONS | -- | 182 | -- | 182 | | --- | -- |
| SUBMARINE ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEM | -- | 228,966 | -- | 85,026 | | -143,940 | -- |
| SOSUS | -- | 31,318 | -- | 31,318 | | --- | -- |
| LAMPS MK I ASW SUPPORT | -- | 8,896 | -- | 8,896 | | --- | -- |
| AN/SQR-18 TOWED ARRAY SONAR | -- | 13,716 | -- | 13,716 | | --- | -- |
| AN/SQR-15 TOWED ARRAY SONAR | -- | 2,659 | -- | 2,659 | | --- | -- |
| SURTASS | -- | 2,367 | -- | 2,367 | | --- | -- |
| ASW OPERATIONS CENTER | -- | 3,268 | -- | --- | | -3,268 | -- |
| CARRIER ASW MODULE | -- | 13,343 | -- | 13,343 | | --- | -- |
| ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT | | | | | | | |
| AN/SLQ-32 | -- | 92,522 | -- | 92,522 | | --- | -- |
| AN/WLR-8 | -- | 2,431 | -- | 2,431 | | --- | -- |
| ICAD SYSTEMS | -- | 3,559 | -- | 3,559 | | --- | -- |
| EW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 679 | -- | 679 | | --- | -- |
| C-3 COUNTERMEASURES | -- | 6,343 | -- | 6,343 | | --- | -- |
| RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT | | | | | | | |
| COMBAT CRYPTOLOGIC SUPPORT CONSOLE | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| COMBAT DF | -- | 13,100 | -- | 13,100 | | --- | -- |
| NAVAL INTELL PROCESSING SYSTEM | -- | 11,705 | -- | 11,705 | | --- | -- |
| SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT | | | | | | | |
| AN/WLQ-4 IMPROVEMENTS | -- | 29,761 | -- | 29,761 | | --- | -- |
| SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROGRAM | -- | 1,196 | -- | 1,196 | | --- | -- |
| OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT | | | | | | | |
| NAVY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM | -- | 106,836 | -- | 106,836 | | --- | -- |
| TACTICAL FLAG COMMAND CENTER | -- | 20,877 | -- | 20,877 | | --- | -- |
| LINK 16 HARDWARE | -- | 35,560 | -- | 35,560 | | --- | -- |
| MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT | -- | 11,309 | -- | 11,309 | | --- | -- |
| NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS | 94 | 14,254 | 94 | --- | | -14,254 | -- |
| HF LINK-11 DATA TERMINALS | -- | 954 | -- | 954 | | --- | -- |
| ARMED FORCES RADIO AND TV | -- | 2,160 | -- | 2,160 | | --- | -- |
| STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 147,851 | -- | 137,651 | | -10,200 | -- |
| SWS COMM/ELEC SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| AN/SQQ - 95 | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| TRAINING EQUIPMENT | | | | | | | |
| OTHER SPAWAR TRAINING EQUIPMENT | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| OTHER NAVSEA TRAINING EQUIPMENT | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT | -- | 17,066 | -- | 17,066 | | --- | -- |
| AN/SQQ - T1 TRAINER | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT | | | | | | | |
| MATCALS | -- | 12,052 | -- | 12,052 | | --- | -- |
| SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL | -- | 5,428 | -- | 5,428 | | --- | -- |
| AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM | -- | 910 | -- | 910 | | --- | -- |
| TACAN | -- | 1,365 | -- | 1,365 | | --- | -- |
| AIR STATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 3,540 | -- | 3,540 | | --- | -- |
| MICROWAVE LANDING SYSTEM | -- | 500 | -- | 500 | | --- | -- |
| FACSFAC | -- | 3,097 | -- | 3,097 | | --- | -- |
| RADAR AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL | -- | 1,415 | -- | 1,415 | | --- | -- |
| ID SYSTEMS | -- | 8,744 | -- | 8,744 | | --- | -- |
| OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT | | | | | | | |
| TADIX-B | -- | 20,689 | -- | 20,689 | | --- | -- |
| NAVAL SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM | -- | 2,158 | -- | 2,158 | | --- | -- |
| SPACE SYSTEM PROCESSING | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| MULTOTS | -- | 160 | -- | 160 | | --- | -- |
| NCCS ASHORE | -- | 11,916 | -- | 11,916 | | --- | -- |
| RADIAC | -- | 1,902 | -- | 1,902 | | --- | -- |
| OVER THE HORIZON RADAR | 1 | 80,558 | -- | --- | | -80,558 | -1 |
| GPETE | -- | 18,702 | -- | 18,702 | | --- | -- |
| INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY | -- | 3,021 | -- | 3,021 | | --- | -- |
| CALIBRATION STANDARDS | -- | 8,176 | -- | 8,176 | | --- | -- |
| EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION | -- | 10,461 | -- | 10,461 | | --- | -- |
| SHORE ELEC ITEMS UNDER $2 MILLION | -- | 11,849 | -- | 11,849 | | --- | -- |
| SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS | | | | | | | |
| SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS | -- | 22,988 | -- | 22,988 | | --- | -- |
| SHIPBOARD HF COMMUNICATIONS | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| SHIPBOARD UHF COMMUNICATIONS | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| FLIGHT DECK COMMUNICATIONS | -- | 1,805 | -- | 1,805 | | --- | -- |
| PORTABLE RADIOS | -- | 5,681 | -- | 5,681 | | --- | -- |
| SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION | -- | 10,878 | -- | 10,878 | | --- | -- |
| SHIP COMM ITEMS UNDER $2 MILLION | -- | 3,748 | -- | 3,748 | | --- | -- |

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

| | Budget | | Committee recommendation | | Senate compared to-- | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Budget amount | |
| SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS | | | | | | | |
| SHORE LF/VLF COMMUNICATIONS | -- | 1,286 | -- | 1,286 | | --- | -- |
| VERDIN | -- | 1,670 | -- | 1,670 | | --- | -- |
| SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT | -- | 9,741 | -- | 9,741 | | --- | -- |
| COMPACT VLF RECEIVER | -- | 11,544 | -- | 11,544 | | --- | -- |
| SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS | | | | | | | |
| SATCOM SHIP TERMINALS | -- | 120,082 | -- | 120,082 | | --- | -- |
| SATCOM SHORE TERMINALS | -- | 9,409 | -- | 9,409 | | --- | -- |
| SHORE COMMUNICATIONS | | | | | | | |
| JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT | -- | 567 | -- | 567 | | --- | -- |
| ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS | -- | 134 | -- | 134 | | --- | -- |
| SHORE HF COMMUNICATIONS | -- | 9,156 | -- | 9,156 | | --- | -- |
| DCS TECH CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| VOICE FREQ CARRIER TELEGRAPH | -- | 680 | -- | 680 | | --- | -- |
| WORLDWIDE WIDEBAND COMMUNICATION | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| WWMCCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT | -- | 96 | -- | 96 | | --- | -- |
| SHORE COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION | -- | 2,980 | -- | 2,980 | | --- | -- |
| SHORE COMM ITEMS UNDER $2 MILLION | -- | 218 | -- | 218 | | --- | -- |
| CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT | | | | | | | |
| SINGLE AUDIO SYSTEM | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| STU-III | -- | 21,275 | -- | 21,275 | | --- | -- |
| TSEC/KG-84 | -- | 35,790 | -- | 35,790 | | --- | -- |
| TSEC/KY-57/58 (VINSON) | -- | 14,705 | -- | 14,705 | | --- | -- |
| TSEC/KYV-5 (ANDVT) | -- | 48,873 | -- | 48,873 | | --- | -- |
| TSEC/KG-81 (WALBURN) | -- | 9,654 | -- | 9,654 | | --- | -- |
| TSEC/KGR-96 (ITSS) | -- | 4,397 | -- | 4,397 | | --- | -- |
| BLACKER CRYPTO | -- | 4,259 | -- | 4,259 | | --- | -- |
| TSEC/KG-58/KGV-6 (PLRS) | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| TRITAC CRYPTO | -- | 4,576 | -- | 4,576 | | --- | -- |
| TSEC/KGV-11 | -- | 6,487 | -- | 6,487 | | --- | -- |
| COMMON FILL DEVICES | -- | 1,087 | -- | 1,087 | | --- | -- |
| SIGNAL SECURITY | -- | 406 | -- | 406 | | --- | -- |
| CRYPTOGRAPHIC ITEMS UNDER $2 MILLION | -- | 5,464 | -- | 5,464 | | --- | -- |
| TSEC/KGV-8 | -- | 2,168 | -- | 2,168 | | --- | -- |
| CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT | | | | | | | |
| CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT | -- | 597 | -- | 597 | | --- | -- |
| CRYPTOLOGIC ITEMS UNDER $2 MILLION | -- | 107 | -- | 107 | | --- | -- |
| CRYPTOLOGIC RESERVES EQUIPMENT | -- | 402 | -- | 402 | | --- | -- |
| CRYPTOLOGIC FIELD TRAINING EQUIPMENT | -- | 134 | -- | 134 | | --- | -- |
| SHORE CRYPTOLOGIC SUPPORT SYSTEM | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| OTHER ELECTRONIC SUPPORT | | | | | | | |
| WAR RESERVE | -- | 432 | -- | 432 | | --- | -- |
| ELEC ENGINEERED MAINT (NAVSEA) | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| ELEC ENGINEERED MAINT (SPAWAR) | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| ELECT. ENGINEERED MAINTENANCE | -- | 3,425 | -- | 3,425 | | --- | -- |
| DRUG INTERDICTION | | | | | | | |
| REDUCTION, REDUCED FORCES | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| REDUCTION, EXCESS REPROGRAMMING | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| GENERAL INCREASE - (DESERT SHIELD) | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, COMMUNICATIONS ANC ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT | | 2,020,969 | | 1,768,749 | | -252,220 | |
| AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | | | | | | |
| SONOBUOYS | | | | | | | |
| AN/SSQ-36 (BT) | 12,200 | 2,096 | 12,200 | 2,096 | | --- | -- |
| AN/SSQ-53 (DIFAR) | 237,300 | 45,584 | 237,300 | 45,584 | | --- | -- |
| AN/SSQ-62 (DICASS) | 28,300 | 23,799 | 28,300 | 23,799 | | --- | -- |
| AN/SSQ-77 (VLAD) | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| GENERAL INCREASE - SONOBUOYS | -- | --- | -- | 87,000 | | +87,000 | -- |
| SIGNAL, UNDERWATER SOUND (SUS) | 7,100 | 1,808 | 7,100 | 1,808 | | --- | -- |
| AIR LAUNCHED ORDNANCE | | | | | | | |
| GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| 2.75 INCH ROCKETS | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| PRACTICE BOMBS | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVLOPMENT | -- | 16,438 | -- | 16,438 | | --- | -- |
| AIRCRAFT ESCAPE ROCKETS | -- | 3,215 | -- | 3,215 | | --- | -- |
| AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES | -- | 41,276 | -- | 41,276 | | --- | -- |
| MARINE LOCATION MARKERS | -- | 6,253 | -- | 6,253 | | --- | -- |
| JATOS | -- | 3,261 | -- | 3,261 | | --- | -- |
| GATOR | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | | | | | | |
| WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 52,537 | -- | 52,537 | | --- | -- |
| EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS | -- | 4,919 | -- | 4,919 | | --- | -- |
| AIRCRAFT REARMING EQUIPMENT | -- | 10,575 | -- | 10,575 | | --- | -- |
| CATAPULTS AND ARRESTING GEAR | -- | 7,261 | -- | 7,261 | | --- | -- |
| METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT | -- | 37,556 | -- | 37,556 | | --- | -- |
| MISC SURVIVAL EQUIPMENT | -- | 4,566 | -- | 4,566 | | --- | -- |
| AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES | -- | 7,988 | -- | 7,988 | | --- | -- |
| LAMPS MK III SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT | -- | 5,514 | -- | 5,514 | | --- | -- |
| REWSON PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT | -- | 1,999 | -- | 1,999 | | --- | -- |

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

| | Budget | | Committee recommendation | | Senate compared to-- | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Budget amount |
| STOCK SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT | -- | 1,236 | -- | 1,236 | --- | -- |
| OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 5,906 | -- | 5,906 | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 283,787 | | 370,787 | +87,000 | |
| ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| SHIP GUN AMMUNITION | | | | | | |
| 3 INCH/50 GUN AMMUNITION | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| 5 INCH/38 GUN AMMUNITION | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| 5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| 16 INCH GUN AMMUNITION | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| CIWS AMMUNITION | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| 76MM GUN AMMUNITION | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT | -- | 15,461 | -- | 15,461 | --- | -- |
| SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| MK-92 FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM | -- | 23,340 | -- | 23,340 | --- | -- |
| HARPOON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 14,025 | -- | 14,025 | --- | -- |
| TERRIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 15,113 | -- | 15,113 | --- | -- |
| TARTAR SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 19,508 | -- | 19,508 | --- | -- |
| POINT DEFENSE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 30,031 | -- | 30,031 | --- | -- |
| AIRBORNE ECM/ECCM | -- | 1,060 | -- | 1,060 | --- | -- |
| AEGIS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 86,233 | -- | 86,233 | --- | -- |
| SURFACE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 29,361 | -- | 29,361 | --- | -- |
| SUBMARINE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 7,075 | -- | 7,075 | --- | -- |
| VERTICAL LAUNCH SYSTEMS | 2 | 63,791 | 2 | 63,791 | --- | -- |
| FBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 20,380 | -- | 20,380 | --- | -- |
| STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT | -- | 86,195 | -- | 86,195 | --- | -- |
| ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| MK-117 FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM | -- | 62,459 | -- | 62,459 | --- | -- |
| SUBMARINE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 7,888 | -- | 7,888 | --- | -- |
| SURFACE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 7,399 | -- | 7,399 | --- | -- |
| ASW RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 7,738 | -- | 7,738 | --- | -- |
| OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIPMENT | -- | 9,867 | -- | 9,867 | --- | -- |
| SWIMMER WEAPONS SYSTEMS-(SOF) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| UNMANNED SEABORNE TARGET | -- | 4,909 | -- | 4,909 | --- | -- |
| ANTI-SHIP MISSILE DECOY SYSTEM | -- | 10,087 | -- | 10,087 | --- | -- |
| CALIBRATION EQUIPMENT | -- | 1,297 | -- | 1,297 | --- | -- |
| STOCK SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT | -- | 1,201 | -- | 1,201 | --- | -- |
| OTHER ORDNANCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT | -- | 2,006 | -- | 2,006 | --- | -- |
| OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE | | | | | | |
| SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMUNITION | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO-(SOF) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION-(SOF) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| QUICKSTRIKE | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| FLEET MINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 19,785 | -- | 19,785 | --- | -- |
| MINE NEUTRALIZATION DEVICES | -- | 3,127 | -- | 3,127 | --- | -- |
| SHIP EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURE | -- | 51,300 | -- | 51,300 | --- | -- |
| REDUCTION, REDUCED FORCES | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| REDUCTION, EXCESS REPROGRAMMING | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 600,636 | | 600,636 | --- | |
| CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| ARMORED SEDANS | -- | 209 | -- | 209 | --- | -- |
| PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES | 452 | 6,810 | 452 | 6,810 | --- | -- |
| SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES | -- | 10,285 | -- | 10,285 | --- | -- |
| GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS | -- | 11,962 | -- | 11,962 | --- | -- |
| TRAILERS/TRUCK TRACTORS | -- | 4,713 | -- | 4,713 | --- | -- |
| EARTH MOVING EQUIPMENT | 124 | 9,126 | 124 | 9,126 | --- | -- |
| CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT | -- | 7,505 | -- | 7,505 | --- | -- |
| FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT | 45 | 4,435 | 45 | 4,435 | --- | -- |
| WEIGHT HANDLING EQUIPMENT | 21 | 3,848 | 21 | 3,848 | --- | -- |
| AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT | -- | 2,207 | -- | 2,207 | --- | -- |
| COMBAT CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 5,477 | -- | 5,477 | --- | -- |
| MOBILE UTILITIES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 2,415 | -- | 2,415 | --- | -- |
| COLLATERAL EQUIPMENT | -- | 10,396 | -- | 10,396 | --- | -- |
| OCEAN CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT | -- | 1,262 | -- | 1,262 | --- | -- |
| FLEET MOORINGS | -- | 3,926 | -- | 3,926 | --- | -- |
| POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT | -- | 3,202 | -- | 3,202 | --- | -- |
| OTHER CIVIL ENG SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 690 | -- | 690 | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 88,468 | | 88,468 | --- | |
| SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| FORKLIFT TRUCKS | -- | 14,120 | -- | 14,120 | --- | -- |
| OTHER MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT | -- | 3,832 | -- | 3,832 | --- | -- |
| AUTOMATED MATERIALS HANDLING SYSTEM | -- | 6,711 | -- | 6,711 | --- | -- |

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

| | Budget | | Committee recommendation | | Senate compared to-- | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Budget amount |
| OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 2,046 | -- | 2,046 | --- | -- |
| POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT | -- | 1,172 | -- | 1,172 | --- | -- |
| FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION | -- | 58,000 | -- | 58,000 | --- | -- |
| SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS | -- | 392,549 | -- | 392,549 | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 478,430 | | 478,430 | --- | |
| PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| TRAINING DEVICES | | | | | | |
| SURFACE SONAR TRAINERS | -- | 3,685 | -- | 3,685 | --- | -- |
| SURFACE COMBAT SYSTEM TRAINERS | -- | 18,634 | -- | 18,634 | --- | -- |
| SHIP SYSTEM TRAINERS | -- | 40,755 | -- | 40,755 | --- | -- |
| TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 2,940 | -- | 2,940 | --- | -- |
| TRAINING DEVICE MODIFICATIONS | -- | 38,659 | -- | 50,659 | +12,000 | -- |
| COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 16,400 | -- | 16,400 | --- | -- |
| EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 7,888 | -- | 7,888 | --- | -- |
| MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 32,188 | -- | 32,188 | --- | -- |
| INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 45,349 | -- | 45,349 | --- | -- |
| ITEMS UNDER $2 MILLION | -- | 856 | -- | 856 | --- | -- |
| OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 18,258 | -- | 18,258 | --- | -- |
| NAVAL RESERVE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 782 | -- | 782 | --- | -- |
| OCEANOGRAPHIC SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 15,550 | -- | 15,550 | --- | -- |
| PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT | -- | 22,941 | -- | 22,941 | --- | -- |
| INDUSTRIAL DEPOT MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT | -- | 348,231 | -- | 301,906 | -46,325 | -- |
| COMPUTER ACQUISITION PROGRAM | | | | | | |
| COMPUTER ACQUISITION PROGRAM | -- | 106,339 | -- | 44,059 | -62,280 | -- |
| PRODUCTIVITY PROGRAMS | | | | | | |
| PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENT (PIF) | -- | 28,126 | -- | 28,126 | --- | -- |
| PROD ENH INCENT FUND (PEIF) | -- | 996 | -- | 996 | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 748,577 | | 651,972 | -96,605 | |
| SPARES & REPAIR PARTS | | | | | | |
| SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | -- | 521,678 | -- | 513,678 | -8,000 | -- |
| REDUCTION, REDUCED FORCES | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| REDUCTION, EXCESS REPROGRAMMING | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| SSN-688 SPARES | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TRANSFER TO ENTERPRISE (SCN) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | 521,678 | | 513,678 | -8,000 | |
| SEQUESTRATION REDUCTION | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT CONSOLIDATION | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY | | 6,081,500 | | 5,811,675 | -269,825 | |

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENTS

During its review of the fiscal year 1991 budget, the Committee found several instances of funds being requested when prior-year funds remained uncommitted. The Committee's recommendations have recognized misalignment of funds resulting from delays in contract awards, problems encountered during development, and delays in deliveries of previously funded quantities had created production backlogs. In those cases where all funding is deleted for programs whose prior-year deliveries continue through fiscal year 1991, the Committee does not intend that the programs be considered new starts in fiscal year 1991, nor that they be considered terminations in fiscal year 1990.

## COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT

*Submarine advanced combat systems.*—The Navy's budget request included $228,966,000 for submarine advanced combat systems. The request included $143,940,000 to build and support an AN/BSY-2 software support facility for deployed SSN-21 Seawolf class submarines. The AN/BSY-2 is the software driven combat system designed solely for the Seawolf class. According to information provided by the Navy, the facility is to be used to support deployed SSN-21 submarines for software maintenance and data base integrity.

The Seawolf program will not have any deployed submarines in the fleet well beyond the time of the facility's scheduled completion date. Therefore, the Committee does not support fiscal year 1991 funding for the facility, and recommends the appropriation of $85,026,000, which provides funding for Trident class AN/BSY-1 support.

*AN/SQR-18 towed array sonar system.*—Last year the Committee recommended that the Navy use available program funds to prototype an improved version of the AN/SQR-18 towed array sonar system. The Navy has followed this direction and the prototypes are to be tested at sea in fiscal year 1991. This improved AN/SQR-18 also could provide a towed array capability for other Navy combatants which are not going to be outfitted with the AN/SQQ-89 ASW system. The Navy did not request funding in fiscal year 1991 to militarize and production-qualify the improved AN/SQR-18, and the Committee believes that this effort should be undertaken in that fiscal year so the system could be deployed at the earliest practicable time.

*Antisubmarine warfare operations facility [ASWOCS].*—ASWOCS are land-based computer processing centers which receive and process flight tapes from P-3 maritime patrol aircraft after surveillance flights. Information provided by the Navy indicates that funds appropriated in fiscal years 1989 and 1990 for the fast time analyzer system were not obligated until September 1990, which will carry production through fiscal year 1991. Therefore, the Committee recommends no funds be appropriated for fiscal year 1991.

*NAVSTAR global positioning system user equipment.*—The NAVSTAR GPS program is a joint Air Force, Army, and Navy program with the Air Force designated as the executive service. The Committee recommends that no funds be appropriated for user equipment in fiscal year 1991, due to indefinite program testing delays. Further discussion of the NAVSTAR GPS user equipment program is found in the "Other Procurement, Air Force" section of this report.

*Strategic platform support.*—The strategic platform support program provides electronics equipment for installation aboard ships and in the Trident training and refit facilities, as well as other Trident shore facilities. Funding for alterations, modifications, and various other support equipment is also included in this program. In April 1990, the Chief of Navy Operations deleted the requirement for AN/BQS-24 sonar system upgrades. Therefore, the Committee recommendation of $137,651,000 for fiscal year 1991 does not include the $10,200,000 requested for the AN/BQS-24.

*Relocatable over-the-horizon radar.*—The relocatable over-the-horizon radar is a shore-based high-frequency radar consisting of separate transmitter and receiver sites controlled by an operations control center. The Navy plans to deploy 12 systems worldwide. However, the Navy acknowledges that a radar currently on contract and scheduled for installation in Guam has been delayed by as much as 2 years for political and environmental reasons. Therefore, the Committee accepts the authorization committee's recommendation to delete the $80,558,000 requested for fiscal year 1991, and install the radar already contracted for Guam in Amchitka instead.

### PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT

*Industrial depot maintenance equipment.*—The Fiscal Year 1990 Appropriation Act transferred this program from the naval industrial fund to "Other procurement, Navy." The industrial maintenance equipment line budgets for industrial equipment, automated data processing equipment and services, and minor construction (expansion) for Navy's depot-level repair facilities, base service centers, research and engineering facilities, and the Military Sealift Command. The Committee is aware that neither the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Production and Logistics nor the OSD Comptroller reviewed this appropriation budget request before its inclusion in the Navy budget submission.

The Navy requested $348,231,000 for fiscal year 1991 to fund projects in this account. However, almost one-half of fiscal year 1990 funds appropriated for this account remain available for obligation.

During its review of the fiscal year 1991 appropriation budget request, the Committee found that $16,614,000 of the funds requested are for projects at locations being considered for closure. The Committee does not support continuing modernization at these locations until the future of these facilities is decided.

In addition, the Committee is very concerned that $65,300,000, or 19 percent of the request, is for automated data processing and information management systems which have not been reviewed for compliance with DOD life cycle management principles.

The following reductions associated with the corporate information management initiative and computer-aided acquisition and logistics support system are discussed at length in the "Corporate Information Management" section of this report.

| | |
|---|---|
| Regional data automation centers | −$4,500,000 |
| MIS for air engineering centers | −6,409,000 |
| Military Sealift Command ADP | −1,033,000 |
| Engineering data management information and control system | −16,453,000 |
| Subtotal | −28,395,000 |

Accordingly, the Committee recommends a reduction of $46,325,000 from the budget request, and the appropriation of $301,906,000 for fiscal year 1991.

Specific recommendations for reductions to industrial/depot maintenance projects are as follows:

(1) *Naval aviation depots.*—The Committee recommends the deletion of $3,014,000 requested for a technical data automation project scheduled for the Alameda Naval Aviation Depot. The Committee does not support funding for projects at bases being reviewed for closure until the future of the facilities is decided.

(2) *Supervisor's desk [Supdesk].*—The Committee recommends the deferral of $4,330,000 requested for the fiscal year 1991 deployment of four Supdesk workstations. The Supdesk is an automated workstation designed to provide information on training, work status, job order analysis, and employee information to a shipyard foreman. Information supplied by the Navy indicates that a limited prototype effort will be procured in fiscal year 1991 using fiscal year 1990 funds. Supdesk expansion beyond the prototype system without a milestone III deployment review would violate section 8026 of this report and DOD life-cycle management principles for ADP systems.

(3) *Industrial activity projects.*—The Committee recommends the reduction of $10,586,000, requested for projects at the Alameda Naval Air Depot, Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, and Long Beach Naval Shipyard, until the future of the facilities is decided.

*Computer acquisition program.*—The Navy requested $106,339,000 for procurement of automated data processing equipment [ADP] for centrally managed major automated information systems. The request includes funding for the replacement of aging automated data processing equipment, expansion of existing systems, and support for various command level information management systems. The Committee strongly supports the Department's corporate information management [CIM] initiative, and believes that continued investment by the services in new systems or expanding existing systems while the Department is developing standard systems is duplicative and unwarranted. Accordingly, the Committee recommends the appropriation of $44,059,000, a reduction of $62,280,000 from the budget request.

The following reductions associated with the corporate information management initiative and computer-aided logistics support system are discussed at length in the "Corporate Information Management" section of this report:

| | |
|---|---|
| Stock point ADP replacement | −$11,623,000 |
| Inventory control point resolicitation | −14,549,000 |
| Navy standard technical information system | −2,734,000 |
| NALCOMIS | −20,262,000 |
| Central processing and distribution | −1,112,000 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Navy occupational health information management system | −1,443,000 |
| Tri-service micropharmacy and food service systems | −505,000 |
| Subtotal | −52,228,000 |

Other reductions include:

(1) *Worldwide military command and control system [WWMCCS].*—The Committee recommends the reduction of $4,730,000 in fiscal year 1991 funds requested for WWMCCS and the WWMCCS Automated Data Processing Modernization Program. Further discussion of this program is found in the "Other Procurement, Air Force" section of this report.

(2) *Station information management system [SIMS].*—The station information management system is designed to link Navy recruiting activities with state-of-the-art computer equipment. The Navy's request for $5,322,000 in fiscal year 1991 funds are for the purchase of hardware and operating software for nine recruiting stations. However, the Navy's fiscal year 1991 approved plan calls for prototype testing at a single, average-sized recruiting district, and not at nine locations. Further, hardware for the prototype site will be purchased with fiscal year 1990 funds. Therefore, the Committee recommends no funding for fiscal year 1991 and directs the Navy not to obligate funds for additional station sites until the prototype site has completed developmental test and evaluation, and is approved for deployment. Further expansion of this system prior to deployment review would violate section 8026 of this report.

OTHER REDUCTIONS

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget request | Committee recommended | Change from budget |
|---|---|---|---|
| General increase—sonobuoys | | 87,000 | +87,000 |
| Training device modifications | 38,659 | 50,659 | +12,000 |
| Spares and repair parts | 521,678 | 513,678 | −8,000 |

## PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $1,213,792,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 782,100,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 667,539,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $667,539,000, a decrease of $114,561,000 below the President's budget request.

This appropriation provides the Marine Corps with funds for the procurement, delivery, modification of missiles, armament, ammunition, communication equipment, tracked combat and wheeled vehicles, and various support equipment.

### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

The following table details the Committee recommendations in comparison to the amended budget request:

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

| | Budget | | Committee recommendation | | Senate compared to-- | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Budget amount |
| PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS | | | | | | |
| AMMUNITION | | | | | | |
| 5.56 MM, ALL TYPES | -- | 30,859 | -- | 29,859 | -1,000 | -- |
| 7.62 MM, ALL TYPES | -- | 8,287 | -- | 8,287 | --- | -- |
| LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES | -- | 982 | -- | 982 | --- | -- |
| .50 CALIBER | -- | 19,543 | -- | 19,543 | --- | -- |
| 40 MM, ALL TYPES | -- | 25,558 | -- | 24,258 | -1,300 | -- |
| 60 MM ILLUM M721 | -- | 10,681 | -- | 10,681 | --- | -- |
| 60 MM SMOKE WP | -- | 3,027 | -- | 3,027 | --- | -- |
| 60 MM HE M888 | -- | 5,651 | -- | 5,651 | --- | -- |
| 81 MM HE | -- | 3,609 | -- | 3,609 | --- | -- |
| 81 MM TP M879 | -- | 9,211 | -- | 9,211 | --- | -- |
| 120MM HEAT MP-T M830 | -- | 16,037 | -- | 16,037 | --- | -- |
| 120MM APFSDS-T M829E1 | -- | 13,125 | -- | 13,125 | --- | -- |
| 120MM TPCSDS-T M865 | -- | 18,649 | -- | 18,649 | --- | -- |
| 120 MM TP-T M831 | -- | 12,926 | -- | 12,926 | --- | -- |
| 155MM HE M107 | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| 155MM M864 PROJ BASEBURNER | -- | 6,161 | -- | --- | -6,161 | -- |
| 155MM CHARGE WHITE BAG | -- | 7,547 | -- | 7,547 | --- | -- |
| 155MM CHARGE GREEN BAG | -- | 4,513 | -- | 4,513 | --- | -- |
| FUZE, PD, M739A1 | -- | 4,276 | -- | 4,276 | --- | -- |
| FUZE PROXIMITY M732A2 | -- | 18,096 | -- | 18,096 | --- | -- |
| FUZE, ET, XM762 | -- | 7,034 | -- | 7,034 | --- | -- |
| FUZE, ET, XM767 | -- | 3,035 | -- | 3,035 | --- | -- |
| 83 MM ROCKET HEAA (SMAW) | -- | 29,339 | -- | 29,339 | --- | -- |
| LIGHT ANTI-ARMOR WEAPON | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| 9 MM ALL TYPES | -- | 3,759 | -- | 3,759 | --- | -- |
| GRENADES, ALL TYPES | -- | 7,884 | -- | 7,884 | --- | -- |
| AMMO MODERNIZATION | -- | 11,663 | -- | 11,663 | --- | -- |
| OTHER SUPPORT | | | | | | |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2 MIL | -- | 3,229 | -- | 3,229 | --- | -- |
| UNALLOCATED INCREASE - AMMUNITION | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, AMMUNITION | | 284,681 | | 276,220 | -8,461 | |
| WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES | | | | | | |
| TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES | | | | | | |
| AAV7A1 PIP | -- | 18,991 | -- | 18,991 | --- | -- |
| MODIFICATION KITS (TRKD VEH) | -- | 3,050 | -- | 3,050 | --- | -- |
| M-1 A1 MAIN BATTLE TANK (MYP) | -- | --- | -- | -80,300 | -80,300 | -- |
| M-1 A1 MAIN BATTLE TANK (MYP) (AP-CY) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| ITEMS UNDER $2M (TRKD VEH) | -- | 322 | -- | 322 | --- | -- |
| ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS | | | | | | |
| ITEMS UNDER $2M (ALL OTHER) | -- | 1,700 | -- | 1,700 | --- | -- |
| WEAPONS | | | | | | |
| MACHINE GUN, 50 CAL M2 | 462 | 4,164 | 462 | 4,164 | --- | -- |
| 5.56MM SQUAD AUTOMATIC WEAPON | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MK-19 40MM MACHINE GUN | 1,181 | 17,227 | 1,181 | 17,227 | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES | | 45,454 | | -34,846 | -80,300 | |
| GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| GUIDED MISSILES | | | | | | |
| HAWK MOD | -- | 5,889 | -- | 5,889 | --- | -- |
| TOW (MYP) | 662 | 10,116 | 662 | 10,116 | --- | -- |
| OTHER SUPPORT | | | | | | |
| MODIFICATION KITS | -- | 250 | -- | 250 | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT | | 16,255 | | 16,255 | --- | |
| COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| MANPACK RADIOS | | | | | | |
| MANPACK RADIOS AND EQUIP | -- | 2,348 | -- | 2,348 | --- | -- |
| VEHICLE MOUNTED RADIOS AND EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| VEHICLE MTD RADIOS & EQUIPMENT (MYP) | -- | 56,010 | -- | 56,010 | --- | -- |
| TELEPHONE AND TELETYPE EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| UNIT LEVEL CIRCUIT SWITCH (ULCS) | -- | 32,924 | -- | 32,924 | --- | -- |
| TACT COMM CENTER EQUIP | -- | 7,415 | -- | 7,415 | --- | -- |
| AN/PSG( ) DIGITAL COMM TERMINAL | 519 | 9,574 | 519 | 9,574 | --- | -- |
| REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| SWEEP GENERATOR | -- | 3,346 | -- | 3,346 | --- | -- |
| ELECTRONIC TEST EQUIP (TEL) | -- | 8,024 | -- | 8,024 | --- | -- |
| OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| OTHER SUPPORT (TEL) | | | | | | |
| MODIFICATION KITS (TEL) | -- | 7,804 | -- | 7,804 | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2M (TEL) | -- | 1,579 | -- | 1,579 | --- | -- |

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

| | Budget | | Committee recommendation | | Senate compared to-- | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Budget amount |
| COMMAND + CONTROL SYSTEMS (NON-TEL) | | | | | | |
| POS LOCATING RPTG SYSTEM (PLRS) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TACTICAL AIR OPER MODULE (TAOM) | 6 | 47,422 | 4 | 31,622 | -15,800 | -2 |
| INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL) | | | | | | |
| LEWDD | 26 | 6,643 | 26 | 6,643 | --- | -- |
| INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 4,244 | -- | 4,244 | --- | -- |
| MOD KITS (INTEL) | -- | 5,051 | -- | 5,051 | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2M (INTELL) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| REPAIR + TEST EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL) | | | | | | |
| ELECTRONIC TDME REPAIR FACILITY | 5 | 3,493 | 5 | 3,493 | --- | -- |
| AN/USM-489 SPECTRUM ANALYZER, PORTABLE | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MECH TEST TMDE | -- | 1,237 | -- | 1,237 | --- | -- |
| ELECTRONIC TEST EQUIP (NONTEL) | -- | 1,662 | -- | 1,662 | --- | -- |
| THERMAL IMAGING EQUIPMENT | -- | 3,502 | -- | 3,502 | --- | -- |
| OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL) | | | | | | |
| ADP EQUIPMENT | -- | 11,524 | -- | 11,524 | --- | -- |
| OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL) | | | | | | |
| TEST CALIB & MAINT SPT | -- | 1,424 | -- | 1,424 | --- | -- |
| MODIFICATION KITS (NONTEL) | -- | 2,543 | -- | 2,543 | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2M (NONTEL) | -- | 898 | -- | 898 | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT | | 218,667 | | 202,867 | -15,800 | |
| SUPPORT VEHICLES | | | | | | |
| ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES | | | | | | |
| COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES | 194 | 3,821 | 194 | 3,821 | --- | -- |
| COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES | -- | 13,113 | -- | 13,113 | --- | -- |
| TACTICAL VEHICLES | | | | | | |
| M876 TRUCK,MAINTENANCE,TELEPHONE/UTILITY | 26 | 4,904 | 26 | 4,904 | --- | -- |
| 5-TON TRUCKS (MYP) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TRAILERS | -- | 2,121 | -- | 2,121 | --- | -- |
| OTHER SUPPORT | | | | | | |
| MODIFICATION KITS | -- | 8,953 | -- | 8,953 | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2 MIL | -- | 1,215 | -- | 1,215 | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, SUPPORT VEHICLES | | 34,127 | | 34,127 | --- | |
| ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| ENGINEER AND EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT | -- | 3,082 | -- | 3,082 | --- | -- |
| LIGHT ROUGH TERRAIN CRANE | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT FUEL SYSTEM | -- | 2,370 | -- | 2,370 | --- | -- |
| TOPOGRAPHIC/SURVEY EQUIPMENT | -- | 3,766 | -- | 3,766 | --- | -- |
| POWER FOUIPMENT ASSORTED | -- | 11,127 | -- | 11,127 | --- | -- |
| MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 4,046 | -- | 4,046 | --- | -- |
| AMPHIBIOUS RAID EQUIPMENT | -- | 201 | -- | 201 | --- | -- |
| PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENT | -- | 16,335 | -- | 16,335 | --- | -- |
| PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT | -- | 301 | -- | 301 | --- | -- |
| GARRISON MOBILE ENGR EQUIP | -- | 5,549 | -- | 5,549 | --- | -- |
| WAREHOUSE MODERNIZATION | -- | 3,027 | -- | 3,027 | --- | -- |
| MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP | -- | 2,219 | -- | 2,219 | --- | -- |
| FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION | -- | 10,900 | -- | 10,900 | --- | -- |
| GENERAL PROPERTY | | | | | | |
| LIGHTWEIGHT DECONTAMINATION SYSTEM | 202 | 3,633 | 202 | 3,633 | --- | -- |
| DRY CHEMICAL FIRE EXTINGUISTER | 196 | 2,123 | 196 | 2,123 | --- | -- |
| TRAINING DEVICES | -- | 3,681 | -- | 3,681 | --- | -- |
| SHELTER FAMILY | -- | 15,254 | -- | 15,254 | --- | -- |
| CONTAINER FAMILY | -- | 15,466 | -- | 15,466 | --- | -- |
| OTHER SUPPORT | | | | | | |
| MODIFICATION KITS | -- | 1,526 | -- | 1,526 | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2 MIL | -- | 2,694 | -- | 2,694 | --- | -- |
| MODERNIZATION OF EQUIPMENT - O & M TRANSFER | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| INSTALLATION OF PRIOR YEAR EQUIPMENT | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| INDUSTRIAL/DEPOT MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT | -- | 5,214 | -- | 5,214 | --- | -- |
| REDUCTION TO ENGINEERING AND OTHER SUPPORT | -- | --- | -- | -10,000 | -10,000 | -- |
| TOTAL, ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT | | 112,514 | | 102,514 | -10,000 | |
| SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | -- | 70,402 | -- | 70,402 | --- | -- |
| GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT CONSOLIDATION | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS | | 782,100 | | 667,539 | -114,561 | |

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENTS

### AMMUNITION

*Quantities excess to 1991 requirements.*—A reduction of $1,000,000 for 5.56 mm ammunition and $1,300,000 for 40 mm cartridges is recommended based on requested procurement levels that are excess to 1991 requirements.

*155 mm M-864 baseburner.*—The Committee recommends a reduction of $6,161,000 for the M-864 baseburner based on type classification delays and production backlogs. This rationale is more fully explained in the "Ammunition Procurement, Army" section of this report.

### WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES

*M-1 Abrams tank.*—The Marine Corps cancellation of their fiscal year 1991 M-1A1 tank procurement has resulted in $111,300,000 excess fiscal year 1990 advance procurement funding in the "Marine Corps Procurement" account.

Congress has thus far approved the use of $31,000,000 of these excess fiscal year 1990 funds as a partial offset for the fiscal year 1990 supplemental. As of this date, the Office of the Secretary of Defense is withholding the balance, $80,300,000.

In its report on the Fiscal Year 1991 Defense Authorization Act, the Senate Armed Services Committee [SASC] has recommended $62,400,000 of unexpended funds be transferred the M-1A1 procurement to purchase an additional 22 M-1A1 tanks for the Marine Corps. The SASC has indicated their concern that the Department's decision to cancel the Marine Corps fiscal year 1991 M-1A1 procurement has left the Marine Corps with too few tanks to provide adequate maintenance reserves and insufficient M-1A1 tanks to support training at Twenty-Nine Palms.

While the Committee agrees that there may be a need to increase the total Marine Corps M-1A1 inventory, the Committee further believes that future Army force structure reductions and resulting equipment redistribution can accommodate any additional Marine Corps requirements. Reductions required to meet the budgetary targets necessitates the Committee recommending the recoupment of the remaining excess M-1A1 prior-year advanced procurement funds in the amount of $80,300,000.

### COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT

*Tactical air operations modules [TAOM].*—The Marine Corps fiscal year 1991 budget request includes $47,422,000 for the procurement of six tactical air operations modules [TAOM]. The TAOM is an electronic tactical data system which, when supported with sensors, power sources, and support equipment, will provide the Marine Corps with the capabilities of integrated air defense, air traffic control, and data link to external agencies for realtime tactical air data.

Congress appropriated sufficient funds in fiscal years 1989 and 1990 to procure 17 modules, which is 77 percent of the acquisition objective tied to the current force structure of the Marine Corps.

The fiscal year 1991 request would attain 90 percent of the current objective. The Committee believes the current acquisition objective will soon be revised to reflect the planned reduction in the number of Marine Corps aircraft squadrons and thus recommends a reduction of two modules and $15,800,000 in fiscal year 1991.

### OTHER ADJUSTMENTS

*General reduction engineer and other support.*—The Committee agrees with the authorization reduction of $10,000,000 for engineering and other support.

## AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $15,679,242,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 13,718,650,000 |
| By transfer | (498,750,000) |
| Committee recommendation | 10,277,853,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $10,277,853,000, a reduction of $3,440,797,000 from the budget request.

This appropriation finances the construction, procurement, modernization, and modification of aircraft and equipment, including armor and armament, specialized ground-handling equipment, and flight training simulators, spare parts, and accessories; specialized equipment; and expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation.

### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

The Committee recommendation for Air Force aircraft programs recognize that substantial force structure reductions will reduce the need for new aircraft purchases. The Committee continues to support the Air Force efforts to acquire advanced aircraft and has recommended reductions in funding for production and modernization of older systems to protect newer systems. In this regard, the Committee supports the administration's plan to terminate the F-15E aircraft and await the advanced tactical fighter. Similarly, the Committee has supported the B-2 program, and denied funding to modernize older bombers. In addition to these actions, the Committee has made several reductions based on schedule changes and reduced costs than assumed in the budget request. The funding recommended is listed in the table below. The specific adjustments are described in the text which follows.

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

| | Budget | | Committee recommendation | | Senate compared to-- | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Budget amount |
| AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE | | | | | | |
| COMBAT AIRCRAFT | | | | | | |
| STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE | | | | | | |
| B-1B | -- | 20,819 | -- | 20,819 | --- | -- |
| B-2A | 5 | 2,495,899 | 2 | 1,989,000 | -506,899 | -3 |
| B-2A (AP-CY) | -- | 710,100 | -- | 76[illegible]0 | +57,000 | -- |
| TACTICAL FORCES | | | | | | |
| F-15 D/E | 36 | 1,201,021 | 36 | 1,699,771 | +498,750 | -- |
| (BY TRANSFER) | -- | (498,750) | -- | --- | (-498,750) | -- |
| F-15 D/E (AP-CY) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| F-16 C/D (MYP) | 150 | 2,357,108 | 88 | 1,671,908 | -685,200 | -62 |
| F-16 PRIOR YEAR | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| F-16 C/D (MYP) (AP-CY) | -- | 437,400 | -- | 248,000 | -189,400 | -- |
| OTHER COMBAT AIRCRAFT | | | | | | |
| MC-130H - SOF | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| AC-130U GUNSHIP - SOF | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, COMBAT AIRCRAFT | | 7,222,347 | | 6,396,598 | -825,749 | |
| AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT | | | | | | |
| TACTICAL AIRLIFT | | | | | | |
| C-17 | 6 | 1,704,486 | 6 | 300,000 | -1,404,486 | -- |
| C-17 (AP-CY) | -- | 204,300 | -- | --- | -204,300 | -- |
| C-130H | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| HC-130 | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| OTHER AIRLIFT | | | | | | |
| C-20B | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| C-27A | 5 | 79,529 | 5 | 79,529 | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT | | 1,988,315 | | 379,529 | -1,608,786 | |
| TRAINER AIRCRAFT | | | | | | |
| OPERATIONAL TRAINERS | | | | | | |
| TANKER, TRANSPORT, TRAINER SYSTEM | 28 | 185,155 | 28 | 162,555 | -22,600 | -- |
| OTHER AIRCRAFT | | | | | | |
| HELICOPTERS | | | | | | |
| MH-60G | 4 | 36,915 | 4 | 36,915 | --- | -- |
| MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT | | | | | | |
| CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C | 38 | 1,881 | 38 | 1,881 | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, OTHER AIRCRAFT | | 38,796 | | 38,796 | --- | |
| MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE AIRCRAFT | | | | | | |
| STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT | | | | | | |
| B-1B | -- | 134,101 | -- | 121,401 | -12,700 | -- |
| B-52 | -- | 109,560 | -- | 69,260 | -40,300 | -- |
| TACTICAL AIRCRAFT | | | | | | |
| A-7 | -- | 1,687 | -- | 1,687 | --- | -- |
| A-10 | -- | 41,620 | -- | 41,620 | --- | -- |
| F/RF-4 | -- | 31,553 | -- | 25,953 | -5,600 | -- |
| F-15 | -- | 130,414 | -- | 130,414 | --- | -- |
| F-16 | -- | 144,026 | -- | 144,026 | --- | -- |
| F-111 | -- | 104,586 | -- | 104,586 | --- | -- |
| TR-1A | -- | 36,000 | -- | 18,000 | -18,000 | -- |
| T/AT-37 | -- | 46,300 | -- | 46,300 | --- | -- |
| AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT | | | | | | |
| C-5 | -- | 64,741 | -- | 64,741 | --- | -- |
| C-9 | -- | 1,700 | -- | 1,700 | --- | -- |
| C-21 | -- | 100 | -- | 100 | --- | -- |
| C-23 AIRCRAFT | -- | 100 | -- | 100 | --- | -- |
| C-STOL | -- | 100 | -- | 100 | --- | -- |
| C-137 | -- | 3,080 | -- | 3,080 | --- | -- |
| C-141 | -- | 35,980 | -- | 35,980 | --- | -- |
| TRAINER AIRCRAFT | | | | | | |
| T-38 | -- | 21,100 | -- | 21,100 | --- | -- |
| T-41 AIRCRAFT | -- | 200 | -- | 200 | --- | -- |
| T-43 | -- | 400 | -- | 400 | --- | -- |
| OTHER AIRCRAFT | | | | | | |
| KC-10A (ATCA) | -- | 4,000 | -- | 4,000 | --- | -- |
| C-12 | -- | 1,200 | -- | 1,200 | --- | -- |
| C-18 | -- | 300 | -- | 300 | --- | -- |
| C-20 MODS | -- | 200 | -- | 200 | --- | -- |
| VC-25A MOD | -- | 200 | -- | 200 | --- | -- |
| C-130 | -- | 39,706 | -- | 39,706 | --- | -- |
| SOF C130 | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| C-135 | -- | 631,900 | -- | 732,182 | +100,282 | -- |

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

| | Budget | | Committee recommendation | | Senate compared to-- | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Budget amount | |
| E-3 | -- | 19,800 | -- | 19,800 | | --- | -- |
| E-4 | -- | 37,300 | -- | 3,800 | | -33,500 | -- |
| E-8 | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| H-3 AIRCRAFT SYSTEM | -- | 100 | -- | 100 | | --- | -- |
| SOF HH-53 | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| H-60 | -- | 5,499 | -- | 5,499 | | --- | -- |
| OTHER AIRCRAFT | -- | 38,824 | -- | 38,824 | | --- | -- |
| SOF OTHER AIRCRAFT | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| OV-10 | -- | 200 | -- | 200 | | --- | -- |
| OTHER MODIFICATIONS | | | | | | | |
| CLASSIFIED PROJECTS | -- | 74,914 | -- | 74,914 | | --- | -- |
| SOF CLASSIFIED PROJECTS | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| CIVIL RESERVE AIRLIFT FLEET (CRAF) | | | | | | | |
| CIVIL RESERVE AIRLIFT FLEET (CRAF) | -- | 2,100 | -- | 2,100 | | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE AIRCRAFT | | 1,763,591 | | 1,753,773 | | -9,818 | |
| SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | -- | 1,391,057 | -- | 532,113 | | -858,944 | -- |
| AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIE | | | | | | | |
| COMMON AGE | -- | 386,627 | -- | 386,627 | | --- | -- |
| INDUSTRIAL RESPONSIVENESS | -- | 45,276 | -- | 45,276 | | --- | -- |
| WAR CONSUMABLES | -- | 41,292 | -- | 41,292 | | --- | -- |
| OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES | -- | 491,474 | -- | 491,474 | | --- | -- |
| COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT | -- | 164,720 | -- | 164,720 | | --- | -- |
| COMMON GROUND EQUIP | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| MODERNIZATION OF EQUIPMENT - O & M TRANSFER | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| INSTALLATION OF MODERNIZATION EQUIPMENT | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS ADJUSTMENT | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| AIRBORNE SELF PROTECTION JAMMER | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES-SOF | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES | | 1,129,389 | | 1,129,389 | | --- | |
| RETIREMENT OF OBSOLETE AIRCRAFT | -- | --- | -- | -114,400 | | -114,400 | -- |
| MILSTAR TERMINALS | -- | --- | -- | -500 | | -500 | -- |
| GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT CONSOLIDATION | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| GENERAL INCREASE - (DESERT SHIELD) | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE | | 13,718,650 | | 10,277,853 | | -3,440,797 | |
| TRANSFER FROM OTHER ACCOUNTS | | (498,750) | | --- | | (-498,750) | |
| TOTAL FUNDING AVAILABLE | | 14,217,400 | | 10,277,853 | | -3,939,547 | |

### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENTS

*B-2 advanced technology bomber.*—The Committee recommends $1,989,000,000 for purchase of two B-2 bombers. This is three aircraft and $506,899,000 below the budget request. The recommendation is consistent with the amount authorized by the Senate. The Committee recommends $767,100,000 for advance procurement funding. This is $57,000,000 above the budget request. The funding is necessary to cover cost increases resulting from production cuts in fiscal year 1991.

*F-15E fighter.*—The Committee recognizes the current plan of the Defense Department which terminates the F-15E program in favor of the follow-on advanced tactical fighter [ATF] and advanced tactical aircraft [ATA] programs. In general, the Committee supports the efforts by the Defense Department to maintain the qualitative superiority of our forces by developing programs with advanced technology even if it requires termination of ongoing programs. However, the Committee is concerned that these new aircraft programs have experienced some delay which will impact on their introduction into the inventory.

The Committee is aware of a concern that if the F-15E program receives no advance procurement in fiscal year 1991, the production line will close. However, the Committee understands that the recent decision to increase foreign military sales will delay this production line closure for at least 1 year if not longer. Therefore, the Committee has recommended no funding for advance procurement.

In the event that the advanced aircraft programs experience additional delays, the Committee will reconsider its view on F-15E advance procurement. As such, the Committee is requesting the Defense Department to reexamine this matter and, if warranted because of additional delays in the ATF or ATA, request advance procurement in its fiscal year 1992 or 1993 budgets.

*F-16 C/D fighter.*—The budget requests $2,357,108,000 for purchase of 150 F-16 fighter aircraft under a multiyear contract. The Committee recommends a reduction of $685,200,000 from the request, reducing production from 150 to 88 aircraft. The adjustment is recommended to account for force structure reductions assumed in the Air Force. The amount proposed includes a reduction of $50,300,000 originally budgeted for an advanced identification friend-or-foe system which the Air Force no longer plans to procure.

Advance procurement for the F-16 is reduced by $189,400,000 from the request of $437,400,000. The reduced level will provide necessary components for a reduced rate in fiscal year 1992.

*C-17 airlift aircraft.*—The Committee recommends $300,000,000 for the C-17 aircraft program. This is a reduction of $1,608,786,000 from the amount requested for production and advance procurement. The C-17 program has fallen behind schedule. Under the currently approved plan, none of the funds requested for fiscal year 1991 could be obligated until the end of the year. The Committee believes appropriating funds for these aircraft is not prudent. However, the Committee is concerned with reports that failure to provide funding could potentially cause a costly interruption in production. Noting that none of the aircraft has yet been delivered, that fiscal year 1990 funds have not been obligated, that funding has been provided for 10 production aircraft which at the most optimistic schedule will not complete delivery until the end of fiscal year 1992, the Committee is not convinced of a costly production break.

The Committee remains supportive of the need to improve airlift forces, therefore, it has provided $300,000,000 for this program. The Committee recommends that the Defense Department forego its plans for a lot IV purchase of two aircraft, that instead it plan for a fiscal year 1992 program to purchase six aircraft. Advance funding was already provided in fiscal year 1990 to support a purchase of six aircraft. The Committee directs the Defense Department to use the additional funds provided herein for vendor base protection. The Committee believes the Air Force should adjust its planned delivery schedule to minimize any work force reductions. Furthermore, the Air Force should be advised the Committee is not favorably disposed to increasing funding for prior year C–17 production costs as has been required in other high cost Air Force acquisition.

*Tanker-transport, training system.*—The Committee recommends $162,555,000 for the purchase of 28 TTTS trainers. This is $22,600,000 below the amount requested. The Committee understands the price on the negotiated contract for the TTTS allows for this reduction.

*B–1B modifications.*—The Committee recommends $121,700,000 for miscellaneous modifications on the B–1B program. This is $12,700,000 below the amount requested. The reduction is related to the 1122 capability improvement. The Committee continues to believe capability improvements are inappropriate on the B–1B if the Air Force is planning to purchase the B–2 bomber.

*B–52 modifications.*—The budget requests $109,650,000 for modifications on the B–52 aircraft. The committee recommends deleting those modifications associated with configuring the B–52G for conventional missions. Considering planned force structure reductions, the Committee believes it is unlikely the aging B–52G will remain in the Air Force inventory for a lengthy period. In addition, the Committee has reduced funds which are not needed for the advanced egress system which was funded in fiscal year 1990, $1,000,000 for advance cruise missile integration, and $15,900,000 for a planned enhancement to the ALQ–172 electronic countermeasures system.

*F/RF–4 modifications.*—The Committee recommends a reduction of $5,600,000 from the F–4 program for Navstar GPS. Because the Air Force now plans to retire its F–4 fleet in the near future, the Committee does not believe upgrading these aircraft with GPS is prudent.

*C–135 modifications.*—The Committee recommends $732,182,000 for modifications to C–135 aircraft. The allowance is $100,282,000 above the budget request. The amount includes an increase of $193,500,000 for the modification of 12 additional KC–135R reenginings. The offsetting reductions are related to modifications which are not planned to be undertaken until the end of the fiscal year. The Committee believes it would be more appropriate to request funding for these programs in fiscal year 1992. The specific reductions are for Navstar global positioning system, ground collision avoidance system, and the fuel savings advisory system. An additional $51,300,000 has been reduced for Milstar, which was terminated in Senate authorization.

*E-4 modifications.*—The Committee recommends $3,800,000 for modification to E–4 aircraft. Funding for nuclear detonation detection and Milstar have been denied.

*Safety modifications.*—The Committee understands that the Air Force plans to tighten its safety modification criteria, implementing expedited procedures for review and approval of safety modifications. The Committee endorses the goal of making process improvements to expedite the introduction of safety fixes into fielded equipment. In this regard, the Committee recommends two minor adjustments in current reprogramming procedures solely for implementing safety fixes for Air Force aircraft modification programs.

Inherently, safety modifications tend to be urgent unforeseen requirements, for which no funds were explicitly appropriated. While the Committee believes current reprogramming procedures provide sufficient flexibility to accomodate changes, the Committee understands that in a few circumstances improved procedures could allow for more expeditious solution to safety problems. The Committee, therefore, recommends that funds in excess of $2,000,000 may be allocated for individual aircraft programs covered in the line item "Other aircraft" following normal reprogramming rules subject to the existing $10,000,000 limitation on the line item. The Committee also directs that the threshold for new start safety modifications be raised from $10,000,000 to $20,000,000 over 3 years.

In recommending these changes, the Committee directs that this flexibility be applied only to urgent unforeseen safety requirements. Within this context, safety modifications are those which correct material or other deficiencies required to ensure safety of personnel, systems, or equipment which, if uncorrected, would ground the equipment, restrict flight or ground operations, or result in unacceptable risk to personnel.

*Spare parts.*—The Committee recommends a reduction of $858,944,000 from the amount requested for purchase of initial spare parts. The specific reductions are related to retirement of obsolete aircraft and lowered purchases of C–17, B–2, and F–16 aircraft.

*Other recommended adjustments.*—The Committee makes the following recommendations consistent with Senate authorization action: TR-1, −$18,000,000; Milstar terminals −$500,000; and obsolete aircraft −$114,500,000.

## MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $6,916,863,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 9,005,700,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 6,243,922,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriations of $6,243,922,000. This recommendation is $2,761,778,000 below the President's budget request.

This appropriation provides financing for the construction, procurement, and modification of missiles, rockets, spacecraft, and related equipment, including investment and repair parts, groundhanding equipment, and training devices; and the expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment, and installations.

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

The following table details the Committee recommendations in comparison to the budget request:

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

| | Budget | | Committee recommendation | | Senate compared to-- | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Budget amount |
| MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE | | | | | | |
| BALLISTIC MISSILES | | | | | | |
| STRATEGIC | | | | | | |
| PEACEKEEPER (M-X).................................... | 12 | 1,727,119 | 12 | 579,962 | -1,147,157 | -- |
| PRIOR YEAR REDUCTION.................................... | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MX MK-21 REENTRY.................................... | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| PEACEKEEPER (M-X) (AP-CY).................................... | -- | 133,900 | -- | --- | -133,900 | -- |
| MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT - BALLIST | | | | | | |
| MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC.................................... | -- | 23,988 | -- | --- | -23,988 | -- |
| PRIOR YEAR REDUCTION.................................... | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, BALLISTIC MISSILES.................................... | | 1,885,007 | | 579,962 | -1,305,045 | |
| OTHER MISSILES | | | | | | |
| STRATEGIC | | | | | | |
| ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE.................................... | 100 | 365,869 | 100 | 365,869 | --- | -- |
| ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE (AP-CY).................................... | -- | 107,400 | -- | 107,400 | --- | -- |
| PRIOR YEAR REDUCTION.................................... | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TACIT RAINBOW.................................... | -- | 227,441 | -- | 59,500 | -167,941 | -- |
| HAVE NAP.................................... | 26 | 25,799 | 26 | 25,799 | --- | -- |
| AGM-131A SRAMII.................................... | -- | 14,820 | -- | 10,100 | -4,720 | -- |
| AGM-131A SRAMII (AP-CY).................................... | -- | 6,390 | -- | --- | -6,390 | -- |
| TACTICAL | | | | | | |
| AIM-9L/M SIDEWINDER.................................... | -- | 420 | -- | 420 | --- | -- |
| AGM-130 POWERED GBU-15.................................... | 63 | 38,434 | 63 | 38,434 | --- | -- |
| AGM-65D MAVERICK.................................... | -- | 7,325 | -- | 60,325 | +53,000 | -- |
| AGM-65D MAVERICK (MYP) (AP-CY).................................... | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| AGM-88A HARM.................................... | 120 | 30,315 | 120 | 30,315 | --- | -- |
| AMRAAM.................................... | 1,250 | 893,382 | 600 | 568,000 | -325,382 | -650 |
| TARGET DRONES | | | | | | |
| TARGET DRONES.................................... | 115 | 46,404 | 115 | 46,404 | --- | -- |
| INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | | | | | | |
| INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS.................................... | -- | 16,211 | -- | 16,211 | --- | -- |
| MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT - OTHER | | | | | | |
| MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-OTHER.................................... | -- | 2,620 | -- | 2,620 | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, OTHER MISSILES.................................... | | 1,782,830 | | 1,331,397 | -451,433 | |
| MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE MISSILES | | | | | | |
| CLASS IV | | | | | | |
| ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE.................................... | -- | 5,029 | -- | 5,029 | --- | -- |
| HAVE NAP.................................... | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MM II/III MODIFICATIONS.................................... | -- | 94,978 | -- | 94,978 | --- | -- |
| AGM-65D MAVERICK.................................... | -- | 3,238 | -- | 3,238 | --- | -- |
| AGM-88A HARM.................................... | -- | 2,074 | -- | 2,074 | --- | -- |
| AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE.................................... | -- | 3,733 | -- | 3,733 | --- | -- |
| PEACEKEEPER (M-X).................................... | -- | 1,937 | -- | 1,937 | --- | -- |
| MODIFICATIONS UNDER $2.0M.................................... | -- | 284 | -- | 284 | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE MISSILES........... | | 111,273 | | 111,273 | --- | |
| SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS.................................... | -- | 271,355 | -- | 255,655 | -15,700 | -- |
| OTHER SUPPORT | | | | | | |
| SPACE PROGRAMS | | | | | | |
| SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC).................................... | -- | 7,621 | -- | 7,621 | --- | -- |
| GLOBAL POSITIONING (MYP).................................... | -- | 120,978 | -- | 120,978 | --- | -- |
| GLOBAL POSITIONING (MYP) (AP-CY).................................... | -- | 80,767 | -- | 80,767 | --- | -- |
| SPACE SHUTTLE OPERATIONS.................................... | -- | 15,128 | -- | 23,128 | +8,000 | -- |
| DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG (MYP).................................... | 1 | 84,068 | 1 | 84,068 | --- | -- |
| DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG (MYP) (AP-CY).................................... | -- | 63,651 | -- | 63,651 | --- | -- |
| DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM (MYP).................................... | 1 | 326,246 | 1 | 326,246 | --- | -- |
| DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM (MYP) (AP-CY).................................... | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| DEFENSE SATELLITE COMM SYSTEM (MYP).................................... | -- | 63,917 | -- | 63,917 | --- | -- |
| SPACE BOOSTERS (MYP).................................... | 2 | 208,580 | 2 | 208,580 | --- | -- |
| SPACE BOOSTERS (MYP) (AP-CY).................................... | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLE.................................... | 5 | 234,475 | 5 | 234,475 | --- | -- |
| MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLE (AP-CY).................................... | -- | 35,256 | -- | 35,256 | --- | -- |
| SPECIAL PROGRAMS | | | | | | |
| FOREST GREEN.................................... | -- | 625 | -- | 625 | --- | -- |
| IONDS (MYP).................................... | -- | 12,899 | -- | 12,899 | --- | -- |
| IONDS (MYP) (AP-CY).................................... | -- | 19,245 | -- | 19,245 | --- | -- |
| SPECIAL PROGRAMS.................................... | -- | 3,101,796 | -- | 2,529,196 | -572,600 | -- |
| SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS.................................... | -- | 237,345 | -- | 37,345 | -200,000 | -- |
| CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS.................................... | -- | 342,638 | -- | 117,638 | -225,000 | -- |

(Amounts in thousands of dollars)

| | Budget | | Committee recommendation | | Senate compared to-- | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Budget amount | |
| MODERNIZATION OF EQUIPMENT, O&M TRANSFER | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| INSTALLATION OF MODERNIZATION EQUIPMENT | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, OTHER SUPPORT | | 4,955,235 | | 3,965,635 | | -989,600 | |
| UNDISTRIBUTED INCREASE | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE | | 9,005,700 | | 6,243,922 | | -2,761,778 | |

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENTS

### BALLISTIC MISSILES

*MX Peacekeeper missile.*—The Air Force has included a total of $1,727,119,000 in procurement and $133,900,000 in advance procurement within their fiscal year 1991 budget request for the procurement of 12 MX missiles and the procurement and advance procurement of trains for the rail garrison mode of deployment for fiscal year 1991-92.

As outlined in the Senate Armed Services Report 101-384, dated July 20, 1990, the General Accounting Office [GAO] has recommended a delay in the procurement of the railcars scheduled for deployment as part of the rail garrison system. The current acquisition schedule would have the Air Force contracting for 73 percent of the railcars prior to the completion of operational testing. The Committee believes that this is a much too concurrent schedule in light of the changes in the last 12 months of the conventional and short-range nuclear threat in Europe, the progress in the START negotiations, and the near-term requirements for defense budget reductions to meet the budget targets. While the Committee continues to support the Peacekeeper rail garrison system, world and budgetary environment allow and necessitate the Air Force to reevaluate the concurrency in the program and delay the procurement of trains until operational testing and evaluation is completed. The Committee, therefore, recommends the deferral of the $1,053,457,000 within the MX procurement budget and $133,900,000 in advance procurement identified for the procurement of trains in fiscal years 1991-92.

The Committee has also been informed by the GAO that the combined fiscal year 1989-90 award for the MX inertial measuring units [IMU's] has generated savings of $93,700,000 over the amounts budgeted for these units. The Air Force should be congratulated for proving once again that competition between two qualified sources will result in savings to the Government over that which the Government would pay in a single-source scenario. The Committee recommends that the savings be brought forward to pay for fiscal year 1991 requirements and, therefore, has further reduced the fiscal year 1991 request by the $93,700,000 in excess prior year funds.

### MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT

*Ballistic missile replacement equipment.*—The Air Force's fiscal year 1991 budget request contains $23,988,000 for the procurement of replacement equipment worn out or damaged beyond economical repair. It provides for the replacement of organizational and base level missile support equipment for strategic missiles.

The General Accounting Office has identified potential reductions in the fiscal years 1990-91 budget requests based upon funding adjustments made by the Air Force's Minuteman System Program Office in anticipation of the retirement of the Minuteman II force.

The Minuteman System's Program Office provided the GAO with updated funding requirements as of April 1990 for fiscal years

1990-91. Those estimates were $34,000,000 for fiscal year 1990 and $14,800,000 for fiscal year 1991. Thus, based upon amounts appropriated in fiscal year 1990 and amounts requested in fiscal year 1991, the GAO has identified an excess of $16,700,000 and $6,400,000 in fiscal years 1990-91, respectively. Program officials agreed with the General Accounting Office's calculation and stated the potential retirement of the Minuteman II system has reduced the need for replacement equipment funding. The Committee, therefore, denies the fiscal year 1991 request and directs the Air Force to use available prior-year funds to support their requirements.

## OTHER MISSILES

*Tacit Rainbow missile.*—The budget request contains $227,400,000 for the procurement of Tacit Rainbow missiles in fiscal year 1991. Because of the continued technical problems identified in the flight test program, the Committee recommends a reduction of $167,941,000 in the procurement request.

The Air Force has informed the Committee that because of failures in the flight test program and the need to restructure the full-scale development program, initial production will be delayed at least 1 to 3 years. Because of the production slip, no production funds are now required in fiscal year 1991.

The Committee does, however, recommend the appropriation of $59,500,000 requested for the nonrecurring cost to support the development of a second source producer. Because of these technical problems and delays, estimates of the unit and total program cost continue to grow. When the production phase does begin, the Committee believes that the competitive environment provided by two facilitized producers will help control cost growth in the future.

*SRAM II missile.*—The Air Force budget request contains $14,820,000 in procurement and $6,390,000 in advance procurement for the short-range attack missile II [SRAMII]. The SRAM II is a supersonic air-to-surface missile designed to replace the SRAM A. SRAM II provides increased range, accuracy, and speed relative to the SRAM A. SRAM II will be capable of penetrating advanced defensive threats from standoff ranges.

The SRAM II contractor has told the Air Force that they are experiencing design problems with their missile software routines as well as throughput problems with the SRAM II missiles guidance computer [MGC]. The Air Force expects that a MGC redesign will be required and that the SRAM II development program will slip a minimum of 6 months.

The Air Force has informed the Committee that of the $21,210,000 requested for procurement and advance procurement of the SRAM II missile, the program will only need $8,100,000 to continue procurement of warhead training and support equipment and $2,000,000 for the Industrial Modernization Improvement Program [IMIP].

The Committee, therefore, recommends an appropriation of $10,100,000 in procurement for the SRAM II missile in fiscal year 1991.

*AGM-130 missile.*—The Department of the Air Force has requested $38,434,000 for the procurement of 63 AGM-130 missiles in fiscal year 1991.

The Committee has recently received a reprogramming request (FY90-30PA) from the Department of Defense requesting the movement of $32,000,000 into the AGM-130 missile program to initiate the first year's production in fiscal year 1990. Because of the lateness of the request, it is highly unlikely that all committees will approve this reprogramming action prior to the end of fiscal year 1990.

The Committee recommends the approval of Defense reprogramming FY90-30PA and the movement of $32,000,000 of prior-year funds into the AGM-130 missile program.

*AGM-65 Maverick missile.*—The Air Forces included $7,325,000 within the fiscal year 1991 budget request to fully fund the program office and the termination cost associated with the end of the Maverick missile production program. The Committee recommends an additional $53,000,000 in fiscal year 1991 and direct the Air Force to continue procuring the Maverick missile beyond the fiscal year 1990 program.

The Air Force originally submitted and the Congress approved the Maverick missile program as a competitive multiyear procurement program for fiscal years 1990-92. Because of fiscal constraints, both the Air Force and the Navy substantially reduced their inventory objective for the Maverick missile system and made the decision to terminate production after the fiscal year 1990 funded delivery period.

The Committee does not agree with the Department's decision to terminate the Maverick production program in light of our recent deployment to the Middle East. The Committee believes that premature termination of the Maverick missile production program will severely restrict the warfighting capabilities of the Air Force and the Marine Corps and, in the case of an all-out war in the Middle East, the current stockpile of Maverick missile would be severely strained.

The Committee direct the Air Force to procure as many Maverick missiles as possible with the total of $60,325,000 provided.

*AMRAAM missile.*—The President's budget request includes $893,382,000 for the Air Force and $421,916,000 for the Navy to procure a total of 1,800 advanced medium-range air-to-air missiles [AMRAAM] in fiscal year 1991.

The Committee is pleased with the progress that the Air Force has made to meet the operational effectiveness requirements of the missile and continues to be fully supportive of the operational requirement of the AMRAAM. The Committee, however, has been informed of continued reliability problems that plague the AMRAAM program. The Air Force has briefed the Committee on their plans to correct these deficiencies and fully expects that the Air Force and the contractors will meet reliability milestones with better quality control and continued testing by the end of fiscal year 1991.

In recognition of the recent decisions by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition establishing reliability goals that must be met before AMRAAM will be allowed to proceed to full-rate production and the Air Forces' proposed testing schedule to demonstrate these goals, the Committee can only support a total Air Force and Navy procurement of 900 missiles in fiscal year 1991. A procurement of 900 missiles in fiscal year 1991 will keep the AMRAAM in low-rate production, at the same levels approved by Congress in fiscal year 1990. The Committee, therefore, recommends an appropriation of $568,000,000 for the procurement of 600 missiles for the Air Force and an appropriation of $297,000,000 for the procurement of 300 missiles for the Navy in fiscal year 1991.

### SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS

*Missile spares and repairs parts.*—The Air Force's fiscal year 1991 budget request includes $271,355,000 to finance replenishment and repair parts needed to support missile operations, crew training launch instrumentation packages, missile training simulators, and surveillance test equipment. This program also finances nonstock funded expense items including munitions/explosive and items necessary to maintain missiles in all up round storage.

Program Office documentation shows that $85,300,000 of the amounts appropriated for this line item in fiscal year 1990 was for Minuteman II replenishment spares. The General Accounting Office has compared the updated fiscal year 1990 funding requirements for the Minuteman II program as of April 1990 and has identified an excess of $15,700,000 in the program. The Committee, therefore, recommends a reduction of $15,700,000 in the fiscal year 1991 program and direct the Air Force to use available prior-year funds to fully fund their fiscal year 1991 requirements.

### OTHER SUPPORT

*Space shuttle operations.*—The Department's budget request contains $15,128,000 for support of Air Force operational space programs launched on the space shuttle. The fiscal year 1991 funds are requested for inertial upper stage [IUS] technical support, payload assist module-DII [PAM DII] integration, and support equipment for shuttle operations.

The request before the Committee contains no funding for the procurement of IUS vehicles in fiscal year 1991 for future Air Force space missions. Current Air Force plans call for long lead in funding in fiscal year 1992 for two IUS vehicles. The Committee has been informed that the Air Force has the opportunity to join NASA in purchasing IUS vehicles in a joint procurement with potential program savings of 17 percent.

NASA launch dates require that their IUS acquisitions begin in fiscal year 1991. The Department of Defense's mission requirements, however, dictate a fiscal year 1992 start of their IUS procurement. The Committee understands that by funding some of the Air Force's long-lead requirement in fiscal year 1991, the Government will realize significant savings from a coordinated NASA/USAF IUS procurement program.

The Committee supports this joint program as a means of maximizing the benefits of economic order quantity procurements. The Committee also recognizes that the Air Force participation in this joint procurement will require funding long-lead items in both fiscal year's 1991 and 1992. The Committee will agree to this exception to normal funding procedures in recognition of the fact that both NASA and the Air Force will realize significant savings and that there are firm requirements for the four IUS vehicles in question.

The Committee recommends the addition of $8,000,000 in fiscal year 1991 and approves the coordinated procurement of IUS vehicles by the Air Force and NASA.

The Committee notes that beginning in fiscal year 1991, the Air Forces will transfer the funding responsibility for replenishment spares to the Air Force stock fund.

*Defense Support Program [DSP].*—The Air Force has included $326,246,000 within their request to complete the five-satellite multiyear procurement of DSP started in fiscal year 1987. A majority of this funding request will go toward the procurement of satellite No. 22 in fiscal year 1991.

Defense Support Program [DSP] satellites, in concert with ground data systems, provide the United States with worldwide early warning of the launch of land-based and sea-based ballistic missiles. The Department of Defense is planning the procurement of a total of 24 satellites through fiscal year 1993. It is the Department's plan to replace the DSP satellite with the boost surveillance and tracking system [BSTS], a follow-on system which has traditionally been funded within the SDI program but has now been transferred to the Air Force. The Air Force has renamed this effort the advanced warning system [AWS].

The original Air Force acquisition plan called for the procurement of 25 satellites through 1994, using a follow-on multiyear procurement of satellites 23–25, with advance procurement funding in fiscal year 1991. This procurement plan would have provided a continual flow of satellites down the production line with resultant efficiency savings. However, because of changes in satellite requirements and budget limitations, the Department has now decided to buy only through satellite 24. The new acquisition plan calls for annual procurement contracts for the final two satellites, 23 and 24.

The Committee is concerned that the follow-on annual contracts for satellites Nos. 23 and 24 will cost the Air Force well in excess of the $800,000,000 currently budgeted in the program objectives memorandum [POM] for the two satellites. In order to help the Air Force control cost growth in this program, the Committee is granting the Department of the Air Force the authority to enter into a multiyear contract to procure satellites Nos. 23 and 24. The Committee is fully aware that estimates of multiyear savings, as compared to current estimates of annual contracts, will not meet the congressional goal of 10 percent savings. Multiyear acquisition authority is recommended, however, because the Committee feels that the out-year annual contract estimates are seriously underestimated and the smoothing effect of a multiyear contract on the production lines will produce more savings than now envisioned. This combination of events will generate sufficient savings to justify the Committee's recommendation to multiyear satellites 23 and 24. The Committee, therefore, has included bill language (section 8014) which allows the Department to enter into a multiyear contract for satellites 23 and 24. To be prepared for an additional satellite requirement beyond No. 24, an option to the multiyear can and should be negotiated by the Air Force for satellite No. 25, to include long-lead funding requirements.

## OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $8,396,853,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 8,307,400,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 7,485,442,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $7,485,442,000 for the "Other procurement, Air Force" account. The recommendation is a decrease of $821,958,000 from the budget request.

This appropriation provides for the procurement of weapons systems and equipment other than aircraft and missiles. Included are munitions, other weapons, vehicles, electronic and telecommunications systems for command and control of operational forces, and ground support equipment for weapons systems and supporting structure.

### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

During our review of the "Other procurement, Air Force" fiscal year 1991 appropriation budget request, the Committee found that the Air Force refuses to submit its justification materials in full compliance with the agreement between the Department of Defense and the congressional oversight committees, as detailed in the Department of Defense Budget Guidance Manual, DOD 7110-1M. Therefore, the Committee directs the Air Force to submit all future appropriation budget requests in full compliance with DOD 7110-1M, part III, section 2, chapter 324.6, paying particular attention, as directed, to part II, section IV, chapter 245 for all budget activities. In the absence of complete justification, the Committee will have no recourse but to treat such budget requests as unjustified and propose appropriate reductions.

During our review of the other procurement, Air Force budget request, the Committee found that funds were being requested for fiscal year 1991, when they were not required until fiscal year 1992. This misalignment of funds and requirements occurred for several reasons: planned contract awards had slipped, development programs suffered problems during testing, and delays in deliveries of previously funded quantities had created production backlogs.

The Committee's recommendations have recognized these program delays and adjusted fiscal year 1991 funding as required. In those cases where all funding is deleted for programs whose prior year deliveries will continue through fiscal year 1991, the Committee does not intend that the programs be considered new starts in fiscal year 1992, nor that they be considered terminations in 1991.

The following table details the Committee recommendation in comparison to the budget request:

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

| | Budget | | Committee recommendation | | Senate compared to-- | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Budget amount |
| OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE | | | | | | |
| MUNITIONS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| ROCKETS + LAUNCHERS | | | | | | |
| 2.75 INCH ROCKET MOTOR | 62,760 | 15,755 | 62,760 | 15,755 | --- | -- |
| 2.75 INCH ROCKET HEAD - WP | 53,088 | 4,486 | 53,088 | 4,486 | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000 | -- | 6,307 | -- | 6,307 | --- | -- |
| CARTRIDGES (THOUSANDS) | | | | | | |
| 5.56 MM | 27,004 | 6,648 | 27,004 | 6,648 | --- | -- |
| 20 MM COMBAT | 1,193 | 6,893 | 1,193 | 6,893 | --- | -- |
| 20MM TRAINING | 14,214 | 38,507 | 9,414 | 25,627 | -12,880 | -4,800 |
| 30 MM TRAINING | 6,610 | 46,563 | 6,610 | 46,563 | --- | -- |
| 40MM HE GRENADES | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| SIGNAL MK-4 MOD 3 | 458 | 613 | 458 | 613 | --- | -- |
| CART IMP 3000 FT/LBS | 1,786 | 6,174 | 1,786 | 6,174 | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000 | -- | 17,043 | -- | 17,043 | --- | -- |
| BOMBS | | | | | | |
| MK-82 INERT/BDU-50 | 67,704 | 23,906 | 45,004 | 15,906 | -8,000 | -22,700 |
| BSU-49 INFLATABLE RETARDER | 46,691 | 19,318 | 34,891 | 14,518 | -4,800 | -11,800 |
| BOMB HARD TARGET 2000LB | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| LASER BOMB GUIDANCE KIT | 33 | 2,076 | 733 | 41,076 | +39,000 | +700 |
| GBU-15 | -- | 28,386 | -- | 28,386 | --- | -- |
| BOMB PRACTICE 25 POUND | 1617,290 | 23,910 | 1617,290 | 23,910 | --- | -- |
| BOMB PRACTICE BDU-38 | 24 | 104 | 24 | 104 | --- | -- |
| MK-84 BOMB-EMPTY | 14,306 | 27,755 | 10,000 | 19,401 | -8,354 | -4,306 |
| CBU-87(COMB EFFECTS MUNITION) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| BIGEYE | -- | 57,822 | -- | --- | -57,822 | -- |
| BIGEYE PRIOR YEAR | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000 | -- | 4,046 | -- | 4,046 | --- | -- |
| OTHER ITEMS | | | | | | |
| FLARE, IR MJU-7B | 236,700 | 4,419 | 236,700 | 4,419 | --- | -- |
| PARACHUTE FLARE LUU-2 B/B | 4,254 | 1,397 | 4,254 | 1,397 | --- | -- |
| MJU-23 FLARE | 5,052 | 7,310 | 5,052 | 7,310 | --- | -- |
| MJU-10B | 157,740 | 7,570 | 157,740 | 7,570 | --- | -- |
| SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | -- | 437 | -- | 437 | --- | -- |
| SPECIAL PROGRAMS | -- | 7,663 | -- | 7,663 | --- | -- |
| MODIFICATIONS | -- | 1,400 | -- | 1,400 | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000 | -- | 17,733 | -- | 17,733 | --- | -- |
| FUZES | | | | | | |
| FMU-139 | 41,112 | 33,404 | 41,112 | 33,404 | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000 | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| OTHER WEAPONS | | | | | | |
| 81MM MORTAR | 45 | 1,228 | 45 | 1,228 | --- | -- |
| HOST NATION SUPPORT WEAPONS | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| SQUAD AUTOMATIC WEAPON | 1,200 | 2,045 | 1,200 | 2,045 | --- | -- |
| M-16 A2 RIFLE WEAPON | 15,000 | 7,120 | 15,000 | 7,120 | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, MUNITIONS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIPMENT | | 428,038 | | 375,182 | -52,856 | |
| VEHICULAR EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES | | | | | | |
| SEDAN, 4 DR 4X2 | 149 | 1,254 | 149 | 1,254 | --- | -- |
| STATION WAGON, 4X2 | 95 | 851 | 95 | 851 | --- | -- |
| BUS, 28 PASSENGER | 44 | 1,985 | 44 | 1,985 | --- | -- |
| BUS INTERCITY | 12 | 2,251 | 12 | 2,251 | --- | -- |
| BUS, 44 PASSENGER | 44 | 3,785 | 44 | 3,785 | --- | -- |
| AMBULANCE, BUS | 1 | 97 | 1 | 97 | --- | -- |
| MODULAR AMBULANCE | 14 | 728 | 14 | 728 | --- | -- |
| 14-23 PASSENGER BUS | 4 | 146 | 4 | 146 | --- | -- |
| LAW ENFORCEMENT VEHICLE | 277 | 3,779 | 277 | 3,779 | --- | -- |
| ARMORED SEDAN | 4 | 700 | 4 | 700 | --- | -- |
| CARGO + UTILITY VEHICLES | | | | | | |
| TRUCK, STAKE/PLATFORM | 306 | 4,608 | 306 | 4,608 | --- | -- |
| TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 3/4T, 4X4 | 214 | 3,785 | 214 | 3,785 | --- | -- |
| TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 1/2T, 4X2 | 201 | 3,142 | 201 | 3,142 | --- | -- |
| TRUCK, PICKUP, 1/2T, 4X2 | 461 | 6,352 | 461 | 6,352 | --- | -- |
| TRUCK, PICKUP, COMPACT | 315 | 2,451 | 315 | 2,451 | --- | -- |
| TRUCK MULTI-STOP 1 TON 4X2 | 305 | 8,240 | 305 | 8,240 | --- | -- |
| TRUCK CARRYALL | 330 | 5,719 | 330 | 5,719 | --- | -- |
| COMMERCIAL UTILITY CARGO VEHICLE | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TRUCK, CARGO 5T M-923.M-925 (MYP) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE | 47 | 3,433 | 47 | 3,433 | --- | -- |
| TRUCK TRACTOR, OVER 5T | 35 | 2,405 | 35 | 2,405 | --- | -- |
| TRUCK, DUMP 5 TON | 52 | 1,789 | 52 | 1,789 | --- | -- |
| CAP VEHICLES | -- | --- | -- | 800 | +800 | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000 | -- | 11,190 | -- | 11,190 | --- | -- |
| SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES | | | | | | |
| TRUCK, TANK, 1200 GAL | 25 | 1,425 | 25 | 1,425 | --- | -- |
| TRUCK TANK FUEL R-11(R-9) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TRUCK, TANK, FUEL, M-49 | 28 | 2,610 | 28 | 2,610 | --- | -- |
| TRACTOR, A/C TOW, MB-4 | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TRACTOR, TOW, FLIGHTLINE | 316 | 5,680 | 316 | 5,680 | --- | -- |

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

| | Budget | | Committee recommendation | | Senate compared to-- | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Budget amount | |
| MOBILE MAINT UNIT | 13 | 4,542 | 13 | 4,542 | | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000 | -- | 13,517 | -- | 13,517 | | --- | -- |
| FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT | | | | | | | |
| TRUCK CRASH P-19 | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| TRUCK CRASH P-23(P-2) | 48 | 22,637 | 48 | 22,637 | | --- | -- |
| TRUCK WATER P-18 | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| TRUCK PUMPER P-24(P-8) | 25 | 3,508 | 25 | 3,508 | | --- | -- |
| TRUCK PUMPER P-22(P-12) | 24 | 2,910 | 24 | 2,910 | | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000 | -- | 2,100 | -- | 2,100 | | --- | -- |
| MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT | | | | | | | |
| TRUCK F/L 4000 LB GED/DED 144 INCH | 96 | 4,163 | 96 | 4,163 | | --- | -- |
| TRUCK, F/L 6000 LB | 133 | 3,346 | 133 | 3,346 | | --- | -- |
| TRUCK, F/L 10,000 LB | 263 | 13,458 | 263 | 13,458 | | --- | -- |
| 25K FORKLIFT | 2 | 498 | 2 | 498 | | --- | -- |
| 25K A/C LOADER | 41 | 6,022 | 41 | 6,022 | | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000 | -- | 4,188 | -- | 4,188 | | --- | -- |
| BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT | | | | | | | |
| LOADER, SCOOP | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| CLEANER, RUNWAY/STREET | 49 | 3,759 | 49 | 3,759 | | --- | -- |
| CRANE, 7-50 TON | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| EXCAVATOR, DED, PT | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | -- | 2,636 | -- | 2,636 | | --- | -- |
| MODIFICATIONS | -- | 837 | -- | 837 | | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000 | -- | 10,176 | -- | 10,176 | | --- | -- |
| FOREIGN VEHICLE PROCUREMENT | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION - TACTICAL VEHICLES | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, VEHICULAR EQUIPMENT | | 176,702 | | 177,502 | | +800 | |
| ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIP | | | | | | | |
| COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC) | | | | | | | |
| COMSEC EQUIPMENT | -- | 77,007 | -- | 77,007 | | --- | -- |
| SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | -- | 4,310 | -- | 4,310 | | --- | -- |
| MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC) | -- | 1,855 | -- | 1,855 | | --- | -- |
| INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS | | | | | | | |
| INTELLIGENCE DATA HANDLING SYS | -- | 8,653 | -- | 8,653 | | --- | -- |
| INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT | -- | 7,374 | -- | 7,374 | | --- | -- |
| INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIP | -- | 1,445 | -- | 1,445 | | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000 | -- | 11,140 | -- | 11,140 | | --- | -- |
| ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS | | | | | | | |
| AIR TRAFFIC CTRL/LAND SYS (ATCALS) | -- | 11,196 | -- | 11,196 | | --- | -- |
| TACTICAL AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVE | -- | 232,027 | -- | 157,027 | | -75,000 | -- |
| WEATHER OBSERV/FORCAST | -- | 49,696 | -- | 45,196 | | -4,500 | -- |
| DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM | -- | 66,756 | -- | 66,756 | | --- | -- |
| OTH-B RADAR | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| SAC COMMAND AND CONTROL | -- | 68,374 | -- | 64,174 | | -4,200 | -- |
| CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX | -- | 9,099 | -- | 9,099 | | --- | -- |
| BMEWS MODERNIZATION | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| SPACETRACK | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| NAVSTAR GPS | -- | 3,863 | -- | 3,863 | | --- | -- |
| USAFE COMMAND/CONTROL SYSTEM | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| PACAF COMMAND/CONTROL | -- | 1,117 | -- | 1,117 | | --- | -- |
| DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG | -- | 17,457 | -- | 17,457 | | --- | -- |
| MARS/USAF-FAA RADAR UPGRADE | -- | 54,807 | -- | 54,807 | | --- | -- |
| TAC SIGINT SUPPORT | -- | 12,003 | -- | 12,003 | | --- | -- |
| DIST ERLY WARNING RDR/NORTH WARNING | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| TACTICAL GROUND INTERCEPT FACILITY | -- | 9,576 | -- | 9,576 | | --- | -- |
| TR-1 GROUND STATIONS | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| AIR BASE OPERABILITY | -- | 3,777 | -- | 3,777 | | --- | -- |
| IMAGERY TRANS | -- | 1,498 | -- | 1,498 | | --- | -- |
| NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM (NDS) | -- | 17,625 | -- | --- | | -17,625 | -- |
| TACTICAL WARNING SYSTEMS SUPPORT | -- | 552 | -- | 552 | | --- | -- |
| SPECIAL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS | | | | | | | |
| AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING EQUIP | -- | 54,746 | -- | 20,366 | | -34,380 | -- |
| WWMCCS/WIS ADPE | -- | 18,357 | -- | --- | | -18,357 | -- |
| MAC COMMAND AND CONTROL SUPPORT | -- | 22,139 | -- | 7,832 | | -14,307 | -- |
| AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM | -- | 24,042 | -- | 24,042 | | --- | -- |
| WEAPONS STORAGE/SECURITY | -- | 21,732 | -- | 21,732 | | --- | -- |
| RANGE IMPROVEMENTS | -- | 66,264 | -- | 30,172 | | -36,092 | -- |
| C3 COUNTERMEASURES | -- | 6,160 | -- | 6,160 | | --- | -- |
| JOINT SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM | -- | 832 | -- | 832 | | --- | -- |
| BASE LEVEL DATA AUTO PROGRAM | -- | 22,109 | -- | 11,257 | | -10,852 | -- |
| SATELLITE CONTROL FACILITY | -- | 87,940 | -- | 87,940 | | --- | -- |
| CONSTANT WATCH | -- | 3,907 | -- | 3,907 | | --- | -- |
| CONSOLIDATED SPACE OPS CENTER | -- | 4,376 | -- | 4,376 | | --- | -- |
| SAMTO TEST RANGES I&M | -- | 47,107 | -- | 47,107 | | --- | -- |
| AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS | | | | | | | |
| PROGRAM 698AJ | -- | 1,781 | -- | 1,781 | | --- | -- |
| INFORMATION TRANSMISSION SYSTEMS | -- | 658 | -- | 658 | | --- | -- |
| TELEPHONE EXCHANGE | -- | 70,882 | -- | 70,882 | | --- | -- |
| JOINT TACTICAL COMM PROGRAM | -- | 72,465 | -- | --- | | -72,465 | -- |
| USTRANSCOM | -- | 15,619 | -- | 15,619 | | --- | -- |
| USSOCCOM | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

| | Budget | | Committee recommendation | | Senate compared to-- | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Budget amount |
| USCENTCOM | -- | 5,095 | -- | 5,095 | --- | -- |
| AUTOMATED TELECOMMUNICATIONS PRG | -- | 3,833 | -- | 3,833 | --- | -- |
| MILSTAR | -- | 178,014 | -- | --- | -178,014 | -- |
| SATELLITE TERMINALS | -- | 18,483 | -- | 18,483 | --- | -- |
| DCA PROGRAMS | | | | | | |
| WIDEBAND SYSTEMS UPGRADE | -- | 13,842 | -- | 13,842 | --- | -- |
| MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMER COMM NET | -- | 3,294 | -- | --- | -3,294 | -- |
| ORGANIZATION AND BASE | | | | | | |
| TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT | -- | 22,612 | -- | 22,612 | --- | -- |
| RADIO EQUIPMENT | -- | 4,010 | -- | 4,010 | --- | -- |
| TV EQUIPMENT (AFRTV) | -- | 4,932 | -- | 4,932 | --- | -- |
| CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT | -- | 4,080 | -- | 4,080 | --- | -- |
| E + I REQUIREMENTS | -- | 1,911 | -- | 1,911 | --- | -- |
| SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | -- | 139,839 | -- | 109,377 | -30,462 | -- |
| CAP COM & ELECT | -- | --- | -- | 500 | +500 | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000 | -- | 15,565 | -- | 15,565 | --- | -- |
| MODIFICATIONS | | | | | | |
| COMM-ELECTRONICS CLASS IV | -- | 18,871 | -- | 18,119 | -752 | -- |
| ANTIJAM VOICE | -- | 4,802 | -- | 4,802 | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIP | | 1,651,506 | | 1,151,706 | -499,800 | |
| OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIP | | | | | | |
| TEST EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| BASE/ALC CALIBRATION PACKAGE | -- | 26,123 | -- | 26,123 | --- | -- |
| NEWARK AFS CALIBRATION PACKAGE | -- | 3,088 | -- | 3,088 | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000 | -- | 39,222 | -- | 39,222 | --- | -- |
| PERSONAL SAFETY AND RESCUE EQUIP | | | | | | |
| NIGHT VISION GOGGLES | -- | 6,554 | -- | 6,554 | --- | -- |
| NIGHT VISION GOGGLES-SOF | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEF PROG | -- | 43,301 | -- | 43,301 | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000 | -- | 6,370 | -- | 6,370 | --- | -- |
| DEPOT PLANT + MATERIALS HANDLING EQ | | | | | | |
| BASE MECHANIZATION EQUIPMENT | -- | 24,324 | -- | 24,324 | --- | -- |
| AIR TERMINAL MECHANIZATION EQUIP | -- | 7,184 | -- | 7,184 | --- | -- |
| ASSET CAPITALIZATION PROGRAM (ACP) | -- | 77,728 | -- | 40,728 | -37,000 | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000 | -- | 15,883 | -- | 15,883 | --- | -- |
| ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| GENERATORS-MOBILE ELECTRIC | -- | 4,296 | -- | 4,296 | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000 | -- | 6,101 | -- | 6,101 | --- | -- |
| BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT | -- | 38,485 | -- | 38,485 | --- | -- |
| MEDICAL/DENTAL EQUIPMENT | -- | 84,246 | -- | 84,246 | --- | -- |
| AIR BASE OPERABILITY | -- | 11,084 | -- | 4,966 | -6,118 | -- |
| PALLET, AIR CARGO, 108"X88" | 4,000 | 3,828 | 4,000 | 3,828 | --- | -- |
| PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT | -- | 9,953 | -- | 9,953 | --- | -- |
| TACTICAL SHELTER | -- | 3,840 | -- | --- | -3,840 | -- |
| PRODUCTIVITY ENHANCEMENT | -- | 8,286 | -- | 8,286 | --- | -- |
| PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENTS | -- | 14,069 | -- | 5,354 | -8,715 | -- |
| MOBILITY EQUIPMENT | -- | 7,899 | -- | 7,899 | --- | -- |
| WARTIME HOST NATION SUPPORT | -- | 9,186 | -- | 9,186 | --- | -- |
| SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | -- | 2,192 | -- | 2,192 | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000 | -- | 24,581 | -- | 24,581 | --- | -- |
| SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS | | | | | | |
| INTELLIGENCE PRODUCTION ACTIVITY | -- | 81,566 | -- | 79,737 | -1,829 | -- |
| TECH SURV COUNTERMEASURES EQ | -- | 1,935 | -- | 1,935 | --- | -- |
| SELECTED ACTIVITIES | -- | 5,354,135 | -- | 5,141,535 | -212,600 | -- |
| SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM | -- | 105,337 | -- | 105,337 | --- | -- |
| INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS | -- | 4,649 | -- | 4,649 | --- | -- |
| MISC EQUIPMENT | -- | 516 | -- | 516 | --- | -- |
| MISC EQUIPMENT-SOF | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MODIFICATIONS | -- | 100 | -- | 100 | --- | -- |
| FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION | -- | 25,093 | -- | 25,093 | --- | -- |
| REDUCTION FOR FORCE STRUCTURE ADJUSTMENTS | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIP | | 6,051,154 | | 5,781,052 | -270,102 | |
| SEQUESTRATION REDUCTION | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT CONSOLIDATION | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| GENERAL REDUCTION (DESERT SHIELD) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE | | 8,307,400 | | 7,485,442 | -821,958 | |

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENTS

### MUNITIONS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIPMENT

*20 mm training cartridges.*—A reduction of $12,880,000 is recommended for procurement of 20 mm training cartridges. The Air Force annually has consumed fewer 20 mm rounds than requested in its budgets. In fiscal year 1991, the Air Force budget increases 20 mm training rounds by 50 percent even though Air Force structure is being significantly reduced. The recommended funding level recognizes historical underconsumption and freezes 20 mm procurement at fiscal year 1990 levels.

*MK-82 inert/BDU-50 practice bombs.*—The Air Force annually has consumed fewer MK-82 practice bombs than it requests. The maximum number it has ever consumed in 1 year is 45,000 bombs. Yet the fiscal year 1991 budget proposes to procure 67,704 bombs. Given historical underconsumption and force structure changes, the Committee recommendation reduces the request to 45,000 bombs. This represents a reduction of $8,000,000 from the budget request.

*BSU-49 inflatable retarders.*—The Committee recommends a reduction of $4,800,000 for procurement of inflatable retarders. The recommendation recognizes program delays and that the request cannot be executed within the funded delivery period.

*GBU-27.*—The Committee recommends an increase of $39,000,000 to procure 700 laser-guided GBU-27 glide bombs. The GBU-27 is a high-priority weapon that is highly accurate and gives Air Force tactical forces the ability to attack hardened, high value targets.

*MK-84 2,000-pound bomb.*—A reduction of $8,354,000 is recommended in recognition of overstated requirements. The Air Force has annually consumed fewer MK-84 bombs than it requests. The maximum number of these bombs that ever has been consumed in 1 year is 7,464. In fiscal year 1989, the Air Force used only 857 MK-84 bombs. The Committee recommendation allows the Air Force 10,000 bombs, more than it has ever used annually.

*Bigeye chemical weapon.*—The Committee recommends no funding for the Bigeye chemical weapon. This represents a reduction of $57,822,000 to the budget request. The administration has canceled this program since submission of the budget.

### ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT

*Tactical air control system improvements.*—The Committee recommends a reduction of $75,000,000, requested for modular control element [MCE] operational modules, and transfers fiscal year 1991 funding to Guard and Reserve procurement. In its revised fiscal year 1991 authorization conference appeal, the Air Force indicated that the authorization committee reduction would prevent the National Guard Bureau from modernizing over 50 percent of its forward air control posts. The Committee's recommendation and appropriation of the funds directly into the "Guard and Reserve" account assures the delivery of 10 MCE systems to the Air National Guard.

*Strategic Air Command, command and control.*—Of the funds requested for Strategic Air Command, command and control for fiscal year 1991, the Committee recommends the reduction of $4,200,000, the amount requested for installation of Milstar and Nudet detection systems equipment in communication shelters. The authorization committee terminated the Milstar program, and funding for the Nudet detection system was restructured at the request of the Air Force. The Committee recommends an appropriation of $64,174,000 to support the remaining mission critical systems of the Strategic Air Command.

*Nudet detection system.*—Subsequent to the budget submission, the Air Force requested the transfer of $17,625,000 requested for fiscal year 1991 from procurement to research and development for nuclear detonation detection system terminal development. The Committee accepts the Senate Armed Services Committee recommendation to delete fiscal year 1991 procurement funds for this program.

*Automated data processing equipment [ADPE].*—The Air Force requested $54,746,000 for automated information systems used to support logistics, personnel, command and control, and financial resources to conduct its mission. As discussed in the "Operation and Maintenance" section of this report, the Committee strongly supports the corporate information management [CIM] initiative within the Office of the Secretary of Defense [OSD] to improve the standardization, quality, and consistency of data among the many DOD automated information systems.

Accordingly, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $20,366,000, with the following program reductions:

(1) *Pilot selection and classification system.*—The Air Force has failed to provide sufficient justification for this program. Therefore, the Committee recommends the deletion of $1,244,000 requested for fiscal year 1991.

(2) *Personnel concept-III.*—The Committee does not support further deployment of the PC–III system at this time. The PC–III system is intended to allow unit-command level users access to an existing personnel system at Air Force bases worldwide. The General Accounting Office reported that the deployment decision has been made even though the system is only partially developed and tested and has not passed significant elements of required operational tests. Given DOD's poor record of ADP oversight and the potential for significant cost increases from future system changes, the Committee denies the fiscal year 1991 request for $29,106,000 to expand deployment of the system.

The following reductions associated with the CIM initiative and computer-aided acquisition and logistics support system are discussed at length in the "Corporate information management" section of this report:

| | |
|---|---|
| Requirements data bank | –$2,946,000 |
| Clinical and diagnostic systems | –1,084,000 |
| Subtotal | –4,030,000 |

*Worldwide military command and control system [WWMCCS].*—The WWMCCS program was restructured in 1989 by the Secretary of Defense, with lead office responsibilities transferred from the

Air Force to the Defense Communications Agency, subject to the approval of the Defense Acquisition Board. The DAB review has been postponed twice, and has not been rescheduled. However, the services continue to modernize their systems and procure WWMCCS equipment under the old program architecture. Given the support needs of the Joint Staff for reliable planning and operational information, the Committee is very concerned with the low priority assigned to the corrective management of this program. Therefore, the Committee recommends no funds be appropriated for procurement until the revised program is reviewed by the DAB, and requirements for all Department of Defense users are reviewed and validated.

*Military Airlift Command, command and control support.*—The Air Force budget request included $22,139,000 for MAC command and control support. Of those funds, $14,307,000 was requested to procure Military Airlift Command [MAC] information processing system hardware. Based on information provided by the Air Force, the Committee believes this request is premature in the absence of a software baseline. Software development requirements were initially underestimated, resulting in a 9-month schedule slip and a high level of development risk to the Government. Accordingly, the Committee denies the funds requested for the hardware procurement, and recommends the appropriation of $7,832,000 for fiscal year 1991 MAC support.

*Range improvements.*—The Air Force budget request included $66,264,000 for range improvements. Given the availability of prior-year funds for the unmanned threat emitter and mini-mutes programs, the Committee recommends the appropriation of $30,172,000 for Air Force training range improvements.

*Base level data automation.*—The Air Force requested $22,109,000 in fiscal year 1991 funding for base level data automation, including $10,852,000 to procure hardware for the base combat ammunition system. The General Accounting Office reported that although this program exceeds the threshold review levels of both the OSD and Air Force major automated information system review committees, neither has reviewed this program for system design or engineering development. This Committee will not support deployment of any automated data processing system which violates section 8026 of this report. Therefore, the Committee directs no funds be appropriated for the base combat ammunition system, and recommends the appropriation of $11,257,000 for remaining base level data automation programs.

*U.S. Transportation Command [USTRANSCOM].*—The Committee recommends the appropriation of $15,619,000, the amount requested to procure hardware to establish the USTRANSCOM Computer Operations Center as a distinct site in the Worldwide command and control system information network. The Committee directs USTRANSCOM not to obligate any appropriated funds for this program until the Defense Acquisition Board approves the restructured WWMCCS program, discussed elsewhere in this section.

*Milstar.*—The Committee concurs with the Senate Armed Services Committee's termination of the Milstar command and control satellite program, and, therefore, directs no funds be appropriated for fiscal year 1991.

*Minimum essential communication network.*—The Senate Armed Services Committee directed the Department of Defense to halt all activities associated with construction and outfitting of the next phase of deployment of the minimum essential communications network. The Air Force has asked the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a study of the health effects of electromagnetic radiation from the nodes of this communications system. The Committee agrees with the authorization committee's direction and, therefore, appropriates no funds for fiscal year 1991.

*Spares and repair parts.*—The Committee recommends the appropriation of $109,377,000, a reduction of $30,462,000 from the fiscal year 1991 budget request. Funds requested for Caribbean basin radar network spare parts ($3,256,000) are transferred to the "Drug interdiction and counterdrug activities, defense" section of this report. Spares and repair parts funding requested for the Milstar program ($27,206,000) are deleted.

*Communication and electronics class IV modifications.*—Class IV modifications are configuration changes of in-service systems and equipment which correct operational deficiencies but do not add or delete capability. The Committee recommends the reduction of $752,000 requested for the unmanned threat emitter [UMTE] disk drive replacement. The UMTE research and development program has slipped a year and is being restructured. The Committee recommends the appropriation of $18,119,000 for remaining modification requirements.

### OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT

*Asset capitalization program.*—The fiscal year 1990 Appropriation Act transferred the asset capitalization program from the "Operation and maintenance" account and appropriated it as industrial/depot maintenance equipment in the "Other procurement, Air Force" account. The funds were appropriated for equipment items and minor construction projects applicable to the Air Force Logistics Command's maintenance organizations. The Committee directs the Air Force to accurately reflect the fiscal year 1990 appropriation act language in its "Other procurement, Air Force" account by retitling the asset capitalization program as the industrial/depot maintenance equipment program.

The Air Force requested $77,728,000 for fiscal year 1991 to fund equipment and services support for Air Force Logistics Center equipment and maintenance activities. The Committee is very concerned that this line item is becoming a wish list for unjustified projects which have not been reviewed by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Production and Logistics or the OSD Comptroller. As a result of its review of the materials submitted by the Air Force, and work conducted by the General Accounting Office, the Committee recommends the deletion of $37,000,000 requested for the depot maintenance management information system [DMMIS]. This reduction is discussed at length in the "Corporate Information Management" section of this report. Accordingly, the Committee recommends the appropriation of $40,728,000 for industrial/depot maintenance equipment.

*Air base operability.*—The Air Force requested $11,084,000 for air base operability in fiscal year 1991, including $6,118,000 for a contingency airfield lighting system. According to information provided by the Air Force, development testing of the airfield lighting system has been delayed 15 months because of user-changed requirements. Given the program delays, the Committee does not support procurement of the system prior to the completion of testing and has provided no fiscal year 1991 funding. The Committee recommends the appropriation of $4,966,000 for remaining air base requirements.

*Tactical shelters.*—The Committee recommends that the $3,840,000 requested for special operations forces tactical shelters for fiscal year 1991 be deleted. Fiscal year 1990 funds remain available for obligation through fiscal year 1991. The Air Force is directed to transfer this procurement item to "Special operations forces in Procurement, Defense agencies" for the fiscal year 1992 budget submission.

*Productivity investments.*—The Air Force budget request included $14,069,000 for productivity investments. Of those funds, the Air Force requested $8,451,000 for a Strategic Air Command electronic warfare testing capability project, and $264,000 for the Trifood computer system for Tactical Air Command bases. The Committee does not believe the "Productivity investment" account is an appropriate vehicle for funding projects such as the electronic testing facility, which have not received sufficient priority for funding within their host command, and would appear more appropriately budgeted within the "Research and development" [R&D] account. If this project is an Air Force funding priority, it should be budgeted and justified in the R&D budget materials for fiscal year 1992, where it will be reviewed as an R&D project, and not as an investment project.

The Committee also recommends the deletion of funds requested for the Trifood computer system. According to information provided by the Defense Medical Support Activity Program Office in OSD, no further deployment of the Trifood computer system is planned until full OT&E of the composite health care system [CHCS] is completed. Further, the Air Force is directed to submit all future funding requests for CHCS-related systems through the OSD Defense Medical Support Activity Program Office for coordination and review. The Committee recommends the appropriation of $5,354,000 for remaining productivity investment projects.

## OTHER ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommends the following other adjustments. Adjustments to classified programs are discussed in the classified annex to this report.

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget request | Committee recommendation | Change from budget |
|---|---|---|---|
| Weather observation/forecast | 49,696 | 45,196 | −4,500 |
| Intel prod activity | 81,566 | 79,737 | −1,829 |

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget request | Committee recommendation | Change from budget |
|---|---|---|---|
| Selected activities | 5,354,135 | 5,141,535 | −212,600 |
| Joint tactical communications program | 72,465 | | −72,465 |
| CAP vehicles | | 800 | +800 |
| CAP communications | | 500 | +500 |

## PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE AGENCIES

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $1,281,913,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 1,969,400,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 1,913,846,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,913,846,000, a reduction of $55,554,000 to the amended budget estimate.

This appropriation provides for procurement of capital equipment for the Defense Communications Agency, the Defense Investigative Service, the Defense Mapping Agency, the Defense Logistics Agency, and other agencies of the Department of Defense. The 1991 program includes procurement of automatic data processing equipment, mechanized material handling systems, general and special purpose vehicular equipment, communications equipments, and other items.

### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

The following table details the Committee recommendations in comparison to the amended budget request:

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

| | Budget | | Committee recommendation | | Senate compared to-- | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Budget amount | |
| PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE AGENCIES | | | | | | | |
| MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD | | | | | | | |
| MOTOR VEHICLES | 2 | 308 | 2 | 308 | | --- | -- |
| MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD/WHS | -- | 78,350 | -- | 82,494 | | +4,144 | -- |
| REMOTELY PILOTED VEHICLES | -- | 24,322 | -- | 24,322 | | --- | -- |
| CORPORATE INFORMATION MANAGEMENT | -- | 145,000 | -- | 163,819 | | +18,819 | -- |
| JOINT SIMULATION OFFICE | -- | --- | -- | 75,000 | | +75,000 | -- |
| MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DNA | | | | | | | |
| VEHICLES | 28 | 433 | 28 | 433 | | --- | -- |
| OTHER CAPITAL EQUIPMENT | 21 | 4,253 | 21 | 4,253 | | --- | -- |
| MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCA | | | | | | | |
| WWMCCS ADP SYSTEMS | -- | 7,602 | -- | --- | | -7,602 | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2 MILLION | -- | 19,809 | -- | 19,809 | | --- | -- |
| PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENT FUNDING | -- | 3,700 | -- | 3,700 | | --- | -- |
| INDUSTRIAL/DEPOT MAINTENANCE EQUIP | -- | 33,888 | -- | 33,888 | | --- | -- |
| MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA | | | | | | | |
| MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT | -- | 4,466 | -- | 4,466 | | --- | -- |
| VEHICLES | -- | 1,534 | -- | 1,534 | | --- | -- |
| MECHANIZED MATERIALS HANDLING SYS | -- | 33,285 | -- | 29,285 | | -4,000 | -- |
| ADP EQUIPMENT | -- | 62,657 | -- | 28,882 | | -33,775 | -- |
| TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT | -- | 18,454 | -- | 18,454 | | --- | -- |
| OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT | -- | 7,729 | -- | 7,729 | | --- | -- |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2 MILLION | -- | 1,243 | -- | 1,243 | | --- | -- |
| INDUSTRIAL/DEPOT MAINTENANCE | -- | 800 | -- | 800 | | --- | -- |
| MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DMA | | | | | | | |
| ADP EQUIPMENT | -- | 18,628 | -- | 18,628 | | --- | -- |
| VEHICLES | -- | 253 | -- | 253 | | --- | -- |
| OTHER CAPITAL EQUIPMENT | -- | 123,059 | -- | 123,059 | | --- | -- |
| MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DIS | | | | | | | |
| VEHICLES | -- | 4,236 | -- | 4,236 | | --- | -- |
| OTHER CAPITAL EQUIPMENT | -- | 184 | -- | 184 | | --- | -- |
| MAJOR EQUIPMENT, USUHS | | | | | | | |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2 MILLION | -- | 890 | -- | 890 | | --- | -- |
| MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA | | | | | | | |
| ITEMS LESS THAN $2 MILLION | -- | 2,081 | -- | 2,081 | | --- | -- |
| MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSPO | | | | | | | |
| MAJOR EQUIPMENT | -- | 213,900 | -- | 132,400 | | -81,500 | -- |
| MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OJCS | | | | | | | |
| MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OJCS | -- | 25,451 | -- | 25,451 | | --- | -- |
| ON-SITE INSPECTION AGENCY | | | | | | | |
| VEHICLES | -- | 50 | -- | 50 | | --- | -- |
| OTHER CAPITAL EQUIPMENT | -- | 950 | -- | 950 | | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, MAJOR EQUIPMENT | | 837,515 | | 808,601 | | -28,914 | |
| SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND | | | | | | | |
| AVIATION PROGRAMS | | | | | | | |
| MC-130H COMBAT TALON II | -- | 85,800 | -- | 85,800 | | --- | -- |
| C-130 MODIFICATIONS | -- | 96,300 | -- | 107,600 | | +11,300 | -- |
| MH-47 MODIFICATIONS | -- | 25,500 | -- | 25,500 | | --- | -- |
| MH-60 MODIFICATIONS | -- | 73,900 | -- | 73,900 | | --- | -- |
| MH-53 MODIFICATIONS | -- | 7,800 | -- | 7,800 | | --- | -- |
| OTHER AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS | -- | 13,500 | -- | 13,500 | | --- | -- |
| AIRCRAFT SUPPORT | -- | 55,300 | -- | --- | | 55,300 | -- |
| AMMUNITION PROGRAMS | | | | | | | |
| 25MM AMMUNITION | 1,093 | 15,696 | 1,093 | 15,696 | | --- | -- |
| ROCKET, HYDRA | -- | 1,400 | -- | 1,400 | | --- | -- |
| RANGER ANTI-ARMOR WPN SYS AMMUNITION | 10,891 | 6,500 | 10,891 | 6,500 | | --- | -- |
| SMALL ARMS AND LANDING PARTY AMMUNITION | -- | 5,500 | -- | 5,500 | | --- | -- |
| PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION | -- | 17,900 | -- | 17,900 | | --- | -- |
| OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS | | | | | | | |
| NAVAL SPECIAL WARFARE EQUIPMENT | -- | 20,500 | -- | 20,500 | | --- | -- |
| COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT MODIFICATIONS | -- | 44,900 | -- | 25,260 | | -19,640 | -- |
| MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT | -- | 3,100 | -- | 3,100 | | --- | -- |
| CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | -- | 67,600 | -- | 67,600 | | --- | -- |
| 4TH PSY OPERATIONS | -- | 10,700 | -- | --- | | -10,700 | -- |
| SWIMMER WEAPONS SYSTEM | -- | 2,000 | -- | 2,000 | | --- | -- |
| SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS | -- | 1,300 | -- | 6,500 | | +5,200 | -- |
| RANGER VEHICLE | -- | --- | -- | 2,500 | | +2,500 | -- |
| COASTAL PATROL BOAT | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| SUBMARINE CONVERSION | -- | --- | -- | 40,000 | | +40,000 | -- |
| TOTAL, SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND | | 555,196 | | 528,556 | | -26,640 | |
| CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | -- | 576,689 | -- | 576,689 | | --- | -- |
| SEQUESTRATION REDUCTION | -- | --- | -- | --- | | --- | -- |
| TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE AGENCIES | | 1,969,400 | | 1,913,846 | | -55,554 | |

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENTS

### DEFENSE COMMUNICATIONS AGENCY

*Worldwide military command and control system [WWMCCS], automated data processing system.*—The Committee recommends the deletion of $7,602,000, the amount of funding requested for fiscal year 1991. This program is discussed at greater length in the "Other procurement, Air Force" section of this report.

*Defense data network.*—A recent report by the Department of Defense Inspector General [DOD-IG] found significant management deficiencies in the planning and operation of the military network segment of the defense data network. The defense data network is a component of the defense communications system, which is operated by the Defense Communications Agency. The military network is a worldwide unclassified transmission system providing data communications to the Department of Defense and other Government and nongovernment activities. The DOD-IG found that nearly 81 percent of the computers in DOD that required data communications services were not connected to the network, because DOD requirements for data communications services had not been adequately planned, and demand for services have expanded far beyond the capabilities of the network. This deficiency occurred in addition to a 3-year delay in the expected completion date for the network, and while projected costs for developing and operating the total network increased from $421,000,000 to $1,039,000,000 for fiscal year 1982 through fiscal year 1992. Based on these findings, the DOD-IG recommended the defense data network be referred to the appropriate defense acquisition committee for oversight and review. However, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition disagreed, asserting that no issues had arisen to warrant elevation of the network for review by the Committee.

The Committee's fiscal year 1991 review of automated data processing equipment, information services, and communications revealed that the Department's poor record of ADP and communications system management continues. The defense data network is an essential component of virtually every unclassified ADP system in DOD, and the committee is not satisfied with the response that the defense data network does not meet established criteria for review as a major defense acquisition.

Therefore, the Committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition to refer the defense data network to the appropriate defense acquisition committee for review and oversight. Further, the Committee directs the Director of the Defense Communications Agency to review and update the definition and scope of the defense data network, revalidate user requirements, and present these findings to the Defense Acquisition Committee and this Committee in an updated management plan no later than June 30, 1991. Any programmatic revisions which result from the review are to be presented with the fiscal year 1992 budget submission.

## DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY

*Mechanized materiel handling system.*—Information provided by the Defense Logistics Agency [DLA] indicates that funds requested for the consolidated packing warehouse contract will not be awarded until fiscal year 1992. Therefore, the Committee has adjusted its recommendation for fiscal year 1991 to $29,285,000, for improvements and systems which assist in materiel processing.

*Automated data processing equipment [ADPE].*—DLA requested $62,657,000 for automated information systems to support logistics management and support functions. Subsequently, OSD began its corporate information management [CIM] initiative to standardize and consolidate data among DOD automated information systems. As discussed elsewhere in this report, the Committee strongly supports the Department's CIM initiative, and believes that continued investment in new systems or expanding existing systems while the Department is developing standard systems is duplicative and unwarranted. The following table provides the Committee's recommendation for the reduction of $33,775,000 from CIM-related systems:

| | |
|---|---|
| Standard automated materiel management system immediate improvement initiative | −$14,000,000 |
| Cataloging tool on-line | −6,500,000 |
| Engineering data management information and control system | −13,275,000 |
| Subtotal | −33,775,000 |

Accordingly, the Committee recommends the appropriation of $28,882,000 for remaining DLA ADPE programs. Reductions associated with the CIM initiative are discussed at length in the CIM section of this report.

## OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

*Joint Simulation Program Office.*—The Committee recommends supporting the Senate Armed Services initiative to establish an Office of the Secretary of Defense [OSD] level joint program office for simulation to coordinate simulation policy, to establish interoperability standards and protocols, to promote simulation within the military departments, and to establish guidelines and objectives for coordination simulation, wargaming, and training.

The Committee, however, further recommends that the control of funding for simulation technology should be controlled by the joint program office for simulation. Currently, each service has a central program office for simulation policies, research and development, and procurement. The Committee believes that much of what each of these individual offices do on a day-to-day basis is duplicative. Within the current budgetary environment, the Department of Defense must look to eliminate redundancies in missions and the Committee strongly believes that simulation technology is an area that can achieve efficiencies without reducing mission capabilities.

To this end, the Committee recommends appropriating $75,000,000 to support the Senate Armed Services Committee's authorizations for the distributed warfighting simulation system, distributed simulation capabilities for the Navy Reserve, the establishment of a joint program office for simulation, and the distributed training system for Reserve components. While this is less than the total amounts authorized, the Committee believes this first-year funding, under the direct control of the joint program office, is a sufficient first effort. The Committee will look to the Department to revise their fiscal year 1991 budget request to include funding for the joint program office and these programs.

To insure streamlining of this mission, the Committee directs that the spaces, both military and civilian, to man the new joint program office shall come from spaces transferred from each of the services simulation offices. The Committee requests that the Department provide each of the defense committees a plan to man the new office and a plan by the joint program office as to the priority of funding of programs authorized by Congress for fiscal year 1991.

*Composite health care system.*—The composite health care system [CHCS] is a state-of-the-art, integrated medical information system which the Department of Defense has been developing for its medical treatment facilities worldwide for over 10 years. CHCS is designed to improve the timeliness, availability, and quality of patient-care data by replacing the manual and automated information systems now supporting defense medical treatment facilities. The Committee strongly supports the CHCS program and urges the Secretary of Defense to continue centralized funding and program management in the OSD defense medical support activity.

*OSD major equipment.*—The Committee recommends the transfer of $4,144,000 from budget requests submitted by the Air Force and Navy for expansion of the composite health care system [CHCS] to the defense medical support activity, the OSD-level program office for CHCS. The Committee directs the military departments to submit all future funding requests for CHCS-related applications to the OSD-CHCS program office for coordination and review. Details of the programs transferred from the services are found in respective ADP sections of the services.

*Corporate information management initiative [CIM].*—The Committee recommends the appropriation of $163,819,000, an increase of $18,819,000 to the budget request. The CIM initiative is discussed at length in the "Operation and Maintenance" section of this report.

*Real-time automated personnel system.*—The Committee directs the Department to include magnetic stripe technology, an especially cost-effective and proven medium, in its planned competition for the acquisition of the real-time automated personnel system [RAPIDS]. The Committee wants to ensure that the Department enhances the security and versatility of the new identification cards by including the magnetic stripe as well as bar coding technologies.

## SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES

The U.S. Special Operations Command [USSOCOM] is the only operational command within DOD which is directly responsible for determining its own force structure requirements, determining related materiel requirements, procuring special operations forces-unique equipment, training, and deploying its own units.

Although the Committee is aware that this is the first budget submission prepared by the Command since its creation in 1986, the Committee was not satisfied with the quality of the fiscal year 1991 budget justification materials. Therefore, the Committee directs USSOCOM to present all future fiscal year budget requests in full compliance with the agreement between the Department of Defense and the congressional oversight committees, as detailed in the DOD Budget Guidance Manual, DOD 7110–1M.

In addition, the Committee is concerned with the Command's requests for programs and equipment in the absence of validated joint mission analysis requirements. Although validated requirements exist for service-unique programs which have been transferred from the services to the Command, the requirements do not reflect USSOCOM's unique joint mission requirements. The Committee is encouraged by the Command's efforts to develop joint requirements by conducting its joint mission analysis, and directs the Command provide this Committee with quarterly status reports.

During our review of the Special Operations Forces appropriation budget request, the Committee found that significant amounts of prior-year funds remained available for obligation because planned contract awards had slipped, development programs suffered problems during testing, or delays in deliveries of previously funded quantities had created production backlogs. The Committee's recommendations have recognized these program delays and adjusted fiscal year 1991 funding as required. In those cases where all funding has been deleted for programs whose prior-year deliveries will continue through fiscal year 1991, the Committee does not intend that the programs be considered new starts in fiscal year 1992, nor that they be considered terminations in 1991. The Committee recommends the following program adjustments for fiscal year 1991:

*Aircrew training system [ATS].*—The command's budget request included $55,300,000 to procure the special operations aircrew training system. The ATS consists of a mission rehearsal device and weapons system trainer. The Committee believes the fiscal year 1991 request for procurement funds is premature, because the full production decision for the mission rehearsal device is not scheduled until the third quarter of fiscal year 1991, and significant software challenges remain. The Committee denies the fiscal year 1991 request.

*Communications equipment modifications.*—USSOCOM requested $44,900,000 for fiscal year 1991 communications equipment modifications. The Committee does not support fiscal year 1991 appropriations for programs which have not awarded contracts for prior year appropriations. In addition, the Committee does not support procurement of items in the absence of requirements documentation. Therefore, the Committee recommends the appropriation of $25,260,000, a reduction of $19,640,000 to be applied to the following programs: special operations improved cryptographic system, special operations power supply, special operations high frequency multichannel radio systems, table top base station, and special operations planning and rehearsal system. The Committee's recommendation includes $1,200,000 in additional funding for 65 LST–5 radios for U.S. Army Rangers.

*4th Psychological Operations Group.*—Funds appropriated in fiscal years 1989 and 1990 will be put on contract in September 1990, carrying production through fiscal year 1991. Therefore, the $10,700,000 requested for fiscal year 1991 is deleted.

*Submarine conversions for dry-deck shelters.*—The Committee recommends the appropriation of $40,000,000 to provide full funding for the accelerated conversion of two ballistic missile submarines. These submarines will be from the latest class of retiring SSBN's (SS–640 class) and will be modified to carry dual dry-deck shelters for Special Operations Forces. The Committee suggests that planning begin as expeditiously as possible to replace the dual dry-deck shelter submarines currently in operation (U.S.S. *John Marshall* and U.S.S. *Sam Houston*) with a like capability. Any gap in capability between the retirements of the currently operating dual- dry-deck shelter boats and equally capable replacements should be minimized.

*Shaldag.*—The Committee recognizes the operational requirement identified by U.S. Special Operations Forces for an Israeli fast patrol boat with the unique design characteristics and performance capability of the *Shaldag*. The *Shaldag* could provide a valuable asset for U.S. drug interdiction and the conduct of U.S. Navy special operations as an interim SEAL insertion craft. The Committee has followed, with interest, the strong initial review of the *Shaldag* by Defense Department officials. As such, the Committee directs the U.S. Special Operations Command [USSOCOM] to examine the purchase, or lease, of the *Shaldag* boat configured as an interim SEAL insertion craft, to carry out an operational test and evaluation of the *Shaldag*. The Committee remains committed to maintaining a strong domestic shipbuilding industry and directs USSOCOM, as part of its evaluation, to examine the potential for coproducing the *Shaldag* in the United States. The Committee directs USSOCOM to report, no later than January 1, 1991, on the progress of its review.

## OTHER ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommends the following other adjustments. Adjustments to classified programs are discussed in the classified annex to this report.

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget request | Committee recommendation | Change from budget |
|---|---|---|---|
| DSPO, major equipment | 213,900 | 132,400 | −81,500 |
| C–130 modifications | 96,300 | 107,600 | +11,300 |
| Small arms and weapons | 1,300 | 6,500 | +5,200 |
| Ranger vehicle | | 2,500 | +2,500 |

## NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $973,720,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 455,400,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 2,499,469,000 |

The Committee recommends a funding level of $2,499,469,000 for National Guard and Reserve dedicated equipment. This recommendation is $2,044,069,000 above the budget request.

Of the total amount provided, the Committee recommends $350,000,000 for the procurement of unspecified everyday unit equipment for Guard and Reserve units.

The Committee requests that the Chief of each National Guard and Reserve component receiving such funds for unit equipment shall allocate them to provide units with the most military capability for the money, based upon the readiness requirements of their respective units. In addition, a report is to be provided to the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services on the items of equipment to be procured with such funds within 120 days after the date of enactment of this act.

### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

The following tables detail the Committee recommendations in comparison to the President's budget request:

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

| | Budget | | Committee recommendation ' | | Senate compared to-- | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Budget amount |
| NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| RESERVE EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| ARMY RESERVE | | | | | | |
| MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT | -- | --- | -- | 75,000 | +75,000 | -- |
| SHOP EQUIPMENT | 18 | 600 | 18 | 600 | --- | -- |
| TEST SET COMMON CORE | 14 | 500 | 14 | 500 | --- | -- |
| HIGH MOBILITY MULTI-PURPOSE WHEELED VEH (MYP) | -- | --- | 5,835 | 181,900 | +181,900 | +5,835 |
| CH-47 MODERNIZATION PGM | -- | --- | -- | 46,300 | +46,300 | -- |
| TRUCK, 5-TON | 915 | 60,000 | -- | --- | -60,000 | -915 |
| TRUCK MODERNIZATION | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| ARMY RESERVE EQUIPMENT CONSOLIDATION | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| COMMUNICATIONS ELECTRONICS | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TOTAL | | 61,100 | | 304,300 | +243,200 | |
| NAVY RESERVE | | | | | | |
| MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT | -- | --- | -- | 75,000 | +75,000 | -- |
| C-130H AIRCRAFT | 2 | 48,000 | 6 | 162,000 | +114,000 | +4 |
| C-20 AIRCRAFT | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MH-53 MINE SWEEPERS | -- | --- | 12 | 281,900 | +281,900 | +12 |
| HH-60H UPGRADE KITS | -- | 8,400 | -- | 8,400 | --- | -- |
| LAMPS MK-1 ASW UPGRADE | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| P-3C AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 4,000 | -- | 4,000 | --- | -- |
| AN-SQQ-T1 TRAINERS | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| AN/AQA-7B(V)18/19 IPADS | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| AN/SQQ - 58 SONOBUOYS | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| INSTALLATION OF MODIFICATIONS | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| NAVY RESERVE EQUIPMENT CONSOLIDATION | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURE EQUIPMENT | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MH-53 TRANSFER | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| CH/MH-53E (HELICOPTER) SUPER STALLION | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TOTAL | | 60,400 | | 531,300 | +470,900 | |
| MARINE CORPS RESERVE | | | | | | |
| MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT | -- | --- | -- | 50,000 | +50,000 | -- |
| KC-130T AIRCRAFT | 1 | 25,000 | 1 | 28,000 | +3,000 | -- |
| AH-1W COBRA AIRCRAFT | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MARINE CORPS EQUIPMENT CONSOLIDATION | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| OH-58D HELICOPTER (AHIP) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| SIMULATORS AND TRAINERS | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TOTAL | | 25,000 | | 78,000 | +53,000 | |
| AIR FORCE RESERVE | | | | | | |
| MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT | -- | 5,000 | -- | 75,000 | +70,000 | -- |
| C-130 AIRCRAFT | 1 | 24,000 | 1 | 27,000 | +3,000 | -- |
| F-16 MODIFICATIONS | -- | 10,000 | -- | 10,000 | --- | -- |
| C-130 MODIFICATIONS | -- | 6,600 | -- | 6,600 | --- | -- |
| INSTALLATION OF MODIFICATIONS | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| AIR FORCE EQUIPMENT CONSOLIDATION | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| AIR RESERVE SPARES | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| TOTAL | | 45,600 | | 118,600 | +73,000 | |
| NATIONAL GUARD EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| ARMY NATIONAL GUARD | | | | | | |
| MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT | -- | 15,000 | -- | 75,000 | +60,000 | -- |
| TRUCK MODERNIZATION | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| NIGHT VISION DEVICES | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MLRS LAUNCHERS | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| CH-47 HELICOPTERS | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| CH-47 (AP-CY) | -- | --- | -- | 180,461 | +180,461 | -- |
| MEDIUM TACTICAL TRUCKS | -- | --- | -- | 56,443 | +56,443 | -- |
| TRUCK, TRACTOR, M915A1 | 313 | 25,000 | 313 | 25,000 | --- | -- |
| TRUCK, TRACTOR, M916 | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| REENGINE PROGRAM FOR 5-TON TRUCKS | 100 | 13,000 | 100 | 13,000 | --- | -- |
| SMALL UNIT SUPPORT VEHICLE (SUSV) | 98 | 8,800 | 98 | 8,800 | --- | -- |
| M577 COMMAND POST CARRIERS | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| M113 ARMORED PERSONNEL CARRIER | 90 | 24,900 | 90 | 24,900 | --- | -- |
| UH-60B HELICOPTERS | -- | --- | -- | 100,000 | +100,000 | -- |
| BATTERY COMPUTER SYSTEM | -- | --- | 24 | 156,000 | +156,000 | +24 |
| C-23 AIRCRAFT | 48 | 30,000 | 48 | 30,000 | --- | -- |
| FAMILY OF HEAVY VEHICLES | -- | --- | 10 | 54,000 | +54,000 | +10 |
| ARMY NATIONAL GUARD EQUIPMENT CONSOLIDATION | 100 | 16,300 | 100 | 16,300 | --- | -- |
| M113A2 TO A3 UPGRADE | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MLRS-BN (SUPPORT PACKAGE) | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| C-26 AIRCRAFT | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| EXTERNAL FUEL TANKS | -- | --- | -- | 5,000 | +5,000 | -- |
| COMMUNICATIONS ELECTRONICS | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| CTG, TANK, 105MM, DS-TP, M724 | -- | --- | 120 | 23,111 | +23,111 | +120 |
| CTG, ARTILLERY, 155MM, ADAM-S, M731 | -- | --- | 8 | 36,928 | +36,928 | +8 |

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

| | Budget | | Committee recommendation | | Senate compared to-- | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Amount | Qty. | Budget amount |
| AT-4, MULTI PURPOSE WEAPON | -- | --- | 11 | 16,642 | +16,642 | +11 |
| PROP CHARGE, 155MM RED BAG, M203 | -- | --- | 45 | 23,319 | +23,319 | +45 |
| TOTAL | | 133,000 | | 844,904 | +711,904 | |
| AIR NATIONAL GUARD | | | | | | |
| C-130 AIRCRAFT | 2 | 48,000 | 12 | 324,000 | +276,000 | +10 |
| INSTALLATION OF MODIFICATIONS | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| C-130 MODIFICATIONS | -- | 34,500 | -- | 34,500 | --- | -- |
| C-26 AIRCRAFT | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| F-16 MODIFICATIONS | -- | 6,000 | -- | 6,000 | --- | -- |
| F-16 SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | -- | 2,800 | -- | 2,800 | --- | -- |
| F-15/F-16 IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| F-15 MSIP | 26 | 39,000 | 26 | 39,000 | --- | -- |
| KC-135 AIRCRAFT MODS | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| CLASSIFIED PROGRAM | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| AIR NATIONAL GUARD EQUIPMENT CONSOLIDATION | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT | -- | --- | -- | 50,000 | +50,000 | -- |
| COOMUNICATIONS - ELECTRONICS | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| JOINT TACTICAL COMM PGM | -- | --- | -- | 72,465 | +72,465 | -- |
| TACTICAL AIR CONTROL SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS | -- | --- | -- | 75,000 | +75,000 | -- |
| AIR GUARD SPARES | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |
| MH-60 HELICOPTERS | -- | --- | 2 | 18,600 | +18,600 | +2 |
| TOTAL | | 130,300 | | 622,365 | +492,065 | |
| TOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT | | 455,400 | | 2,499,469 | +2,044,069 | |

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENTS

### ARMY RESERVE

*Miscellaneous equipment.*—The Committee recommends $75,000,000 for the procurement of unspecified miscellaneous equipment purchases to improve the readiness ratings of Army Reserve units.

*High mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicles [HMMWV].*—The Committee recommends the transfer of $181,900,000 from the "Active Army other procurement" account to the "Army Reserve" account for the procurement of 5,835 high mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicles for Army Reserve units.

*5-ton trucks.*—The Committee recommends the denial of the $60,000,000 requested for the procurement of 5-ton trucks for Army Reserve units.

Prior year production and deliveries of 5-ton trucks have been delayed as a result of problems experienced by the new 5-ton truck producer. Additional funding for 5-ton trucks in fiscal year 1991 would not be obligated until fiscal year 1992. The Committee strongly supports the 5-ton truck program and fully expects that all startup delays can be overcome.

*CH-47 modernization program.*—The Committee recommends a transfer of $46,300,000 of funds requested in the Army aircraft procurement appropriation. This recommendation consolidates all CH-47 modernization funding in the National Guard and Reserve equipment, defense appropriation.

### NAVY RESERVE

*Miscellaneous equipment.*—The Committee recommends $75,000,000 for the procurement of unspecified miscellaneous equipment purchases to improve the readiness ratings of Naval Reserve units.

*C–130 aircraft.*—The Committee recommends $162,000,000 for the purchase of six C–130 aircraft for the Navy Reserve. The Committee understands these aircraft will fill the requirement for two C–130 units in the Navy Reserve. The allowance includes an increase of $3,000,000 per aircraft above the purchase price to provide for additional modifications to a standard defense configuration.

*MH–53E minesweepers.*—The Committee recommends $281,900,000 for the purchase of 12 MH–53E minesweeping helicopters for the Navy Reserve, consistent with Senate-passed authorization.

### MARINE CORPS RESERVE

*Miscellaneous equipment.*—The Committee recommends $50,000,000 for the procurement of unspecified miscellaneous equipment purchases to improve the readiness ratings of Marine Corps units.

*KC–130T tanker aircraft.*—The Committee recommends an increase of $3,000,000 for the purchase of one KC–130T tanker aircraft for the Marine Corps. The increase will allow the modification of the aircraft to a standard defense configuration.

### AIR FORCE RESERVE

*Miscellaneous equipment.*—The Committee recommends $75,000,000, an increase of $70,000,000 over the amounts requested, for the procurement of unspecified miscellaneous equipment purchases to improve the readiness ratings of Air Force Reserve units.

*C–130 aircraft.*—The Committee recommendation increases funding by $3,000,000 for the purchase of one C–130 aircraft to allow the modification to a standard defense configuration.

### ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

*Miscellaneous equipment.*—The Committee recommends $75,000,000 for the procurement of unspecified miscellaneous equipment purchases to improve the readiness ratings of Army National Guard units. This is an increase of $60,000,000 over the amounts requested.

*UH–60 helicopters.*—The Committee recommends the transfer of $156,000,000 from the "Army aircraft procurement" account for the purchase of 24 UH–60 helicopters, consistent with the Senate-passed authorization. The Committee understands that four of these aircraft shall be available for the Alaska Army National Guard.

*CH–47 modernization program.*—The Committee recommends the transfer of $236,904,000 from the Army aircraft procurement appropriation to consolidate the CH–47 modernization program in the National Guard and Reserve equipment, defense appropriation.

*M–113 family of armored vehicles.*—The Committee recommends the appropriation of $100,000,000 for the procurement and modification of the M–113 family of armored vehicles.

*C–23 aircraft.*—The Committee recommends $54,000,000 for the purchase of 10 C–23 aircraft for the Army National Guard. These aircraft shall be for replacement of aging logistics aircraft.

*UH–1 external fuel tanks.*—The Committee recommends $5,000,000 for purchase of external fuel tanks for existing UH–1 helicopters. The Committee understands these tanks could be available for the Louisiana and Wyoming National Guards.

### AIR NATIONAL GUARD

*Miscellaneous equipment.*—The Committee recommends $50,000,000 for the procurement of unspecified miscellaneous equipment purchases to improve the readiness ratings of Air National Guard units.

*C–130 aircraft.*—The Committee recommends $324,000,000 for the purchase of 12 C–130 aircraft for the Air National Guard. The Committee has included a $3,000,000 increase above the assumed purchase price of each C–130 to allow the modification of the aircraft to a standard defense configuration.

*Joint tactical communications program.*—The Committee recommends the transfer of $72,465,000 from the "Other procurement Air Force" account to the "Air National Guard" account for the procurement of echelon above corps communications equipment, formerly known as Tri-Tac.

*Tactical air control system improvements.*—The Committee recommends the transfer of $75,000,000 for modular control element [MCE] operational modules from the "Other procurement Air Force" account to the "Air National Guard" account. In its revised fiscal year 1991 authorization conference appeal, the Air Force indicated that because of the authorization committee reduction, the National Guard Bureau would not be able to modernize over 50 percent of its forward air control posts. The Committee's recommendation assures the delivery of 10 MCE systems to the Air National Guard.

*MH-60 helicopters.*—The Committee recommends $18,600,000 for the purchase of two MH-60 search and rescue helicopters for the Air National Guard.

## DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $49,479,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 1,800,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 30,000,000 |

The Committee recommends $30,000,000 for the fiscal year 1991 Defense Production Act purchases programs. This recommendation is $28,200,000 above the amount requested in the President's budget submission.

These funds will provide for the purchase or commitments to purchase critical defense metals, minerals, or other materials with the express purpose of creating a domestic source or increasing the current U.S. industrial capacity.

The $1,800,000 requested by the Department supports the follow-on project for rhenium metal approved in fiscal year 1990. The fiscal year 1991 funding will complete phase II, expanding capacity of rhenium metal by 6,000 pounds per year.

# TITLE IV

# RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

## SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ACTION

The fiscal year 1991 Department of Defense budget request for research, development, test, and evaluation totaled $38,092,800,000. The accompanying Senate bill contains $34,140,306,000, a reduction of $3,952,494,000, or about 10.4 percent, from the budget estimate. The recommended allowance is $2,892,941,000 below the fiscal year 1990 appropriation for RDT&E. The following table summarizes the budget estimates and Committee recommendations:

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget estimate | Committee recommendation | Change from budget |
|---|---|---|---|
| RDT&E Army | 6,025,000 | 5,299,793 | −726,107 |
| RDT&E Navy | 9,102,000 | 8,459,853 | −642,547 |
| RDT&E Air Force | 13,276,300 | 11,575,574 | −1,700,726 |
| RDT&E defense agencies | 9,249,300 | 8,563,407 | −685,893 |
| Director of Test and Evaluation | 348,100 | 226,679 | −121,421 |
| Director of Operational Test and Evaluation | 90,800 | 15,000 | −75,800 |
| Total, title IV, RDT&E | 38,092,800 | 34,140,306 | −3,952,494 |

## COMMITTEE OVERVIEW

The following considerations are the context for the Committee's review of the fiscal year 1991 budget request for defense RDT&E:

First, fiscal year 1991 is—or should be—a transition year for the Defense Department, as it adjusts to the great changes in the international security environment and to the severe fiscal constraints expected in the future. These adjustments should have major impacts on defense RDT&E, just as on other components of the Defense budget. The Committee expects fiscal year 1991 will be a hold-the-line and build-down period for defense RDT&E activities.

The Committee's programmatic recommendations reflect this expectation. Requested major program funding increases and major contract awards—especially those based on previous threat assessments or fiscal assumptions—are deferred, absent an overwhelming military justification to the contrary. New starts, poorly justified programs, unstable projects, programs with high technological risks or concurrency, and programs with large, probably unaffordable, funding profiles, are denied, or maintained at the fiscal year 1990 level. Programs to develop platforms and systems which might be significantly affected by any forthcoming force structure reductions also are deferred.

The Committee believes Congress should reconsider these proposed increases, commitments, and RDT&E activities in the changed military and fiscal contexts of the fiscal year 1992 defense budget review.

Second, as the defense establishment changes and contracts, even with increased regional military threats, care must be exercised to mortgage neither the present nor the future in military RDT&E. Major reallocations to increase technology base funding to ensure U.S. military superiority 30 years hence must be balanced against the requirement to preserve adequate RDT&E aimed at maintaining and improving our defense posture in the next 15 years.

The Committee expects that the evolving military and fiscal environment will be defined better during next year's defense budget deliberations. Such a clearer definition may permit significant RDT&E reallocations in the fiscal year 1992 budget, if appropriate.

This said, the Committee believes that efforts to develop critical defense technologies should be protected as much as possible in fiscal year 1991. The Committee recommended modest initiatives in several areas for this reason.

Third, the Defense Department's RDT&E infrastructure can be expected to contract, along with the likely reduction in the rest of the military establishment. For this reason, the Committee has recommended that funding be maintained at the fiscal year 1990 level for most RDT&E infrastructure and general support programs.

## MAJOR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Reflecting this approach, the Committee's major recommendations, by Defense Department component, are:

*Army.*—(1) Providing $818,301,000 for technology base programs, $49,417,000 more than the budget request for these fundamental RDT&E programs; (2) restructuring the armored systems modernization [ASM] and related programs as follows: (*a*) providing $21,800,000 for the advanced field artillery system [AFAS], an increase of $18,000,000 to the budget request to enhance development of artillery propellants; (*b*) eliminating the $113,000,000 request for the block III tank upgrade; and (*c*) reducing by $46,337,000 funds for the advanced tank cannon system; (3) adding $12,000,000 for development of new electrothermal, electrochemical, and electromagnetic gun technologies, and $15,000,000 to begin development of a new, 120 mm rocket-assisted kinetic energy [RAKE] tank projectile; (4) approving $90,700,000 to continue development of the M-1A2 tank; (5) adjusting Army helicopter programs as follows: (*a*) fully funding the rephased, light helicopter [LH] program at $315,000,000 for the airframe and engine; (*b*) eliminating the $25,817,000 requested for the Armed Army Helicopter Improvement Program [AHIP]; and (*c*) providing $171,514,000 for the Apache AH-64 Longbow missile and radar system, a decrease of $48,000,000; (6) approving $44,558,000, an increase of $22,000,000 to the budget to enhance Army human immunodeficiency virus [HIV] research to combat acquired immune deficiency syndrome [AIDS]; (7) providing $141,711,000 for medical research and technology programs, an increase of $10,000,000 for Army research into tropical infectious diseases; (8) funding $158,082,000 for development of kinetic energy (nonlaser) antisatellite [ASAT] weapons and $25,000,000 for development of directed-energy (laser) ASAT capabilities; (9) including $52,881,000 to continue testing and maintain the contractor work force for the Line of Sight Anti-Tank [LOSAT] Program, but not allowing full-scale development to proceed; (10) adding $7,500,000 for development of close combat tactical trainers [CCTT] for the Army National Guard and Reserve; (11) including $99,062,000 for continued development of the fiber optic guided missile and $105,507,000 for development of the sense and destroy armament missile submunition for 155 mm artillery and the MLRS system; and (12) providing $333,800,000 for chemical and biological defense research and development, an increase of $50,000,000 above the budget request.

*Navy/Marine Corps.*—(1) Recommending bill language to require the Defense Department to initiate a fast sealift technology research and development program; (2) approving $53,799,000 for the Electric Drive Advanced Ship Propulsion/Power Program, an increase of $10,000,000 to the budget request; (3) providing $238,000,000 in new and prior-year spending authority to continue development of the V-22A tilt-rotor aircraft; (4) adding $71,000,000 to continue development of the Sea Lance antisubmarine warfare [ASW] standoff weapon, and deleting $30,000,000 for the vertical launch ASROC, an alternative system; (5) creating a USN/USMC mine warfare program, funded at $15,697,000, to develop a single airborne countermine system for both services; (6) fully funding F-14 upgrades at the requested amount of $121,428,000; (7) modifying nonacoustic antisubmarine warfare programs as follows: (*a*) adding $8,435,000 to the SSBN security technology program; and (*b*) approving $14,000,000 of the requested $22,884,000 for a Navy generic nonacoustic ASW program, and transferring the remaining $8,884,000 to a joint program in the Office of the Secretary of Defense [OSD]; (8) including $7,500,000, an increase of $5,000,000 to the budget request, to enhance the Navy's sea launch and recovery project [SEALAR] to develop low-cost space launch vehicles; (9) deferring the classified request to develop a costly new wide area surveillance system (the Air Force's proposal also was deferred); (10) fully funding the following submarine RDT&E programs: (*a*) $186,893,000 for SSN-21 developments, and (*b*) $346,729,000 for the Submarine Combat System Program; (11) approving the classified budget request for development of the baseline A-12 aircraft, and the $65,685,000 requested for the Navy advanced tactical fighter [NATF]; (12) providing the $84,225,000 requested for the advanced air-to-air missile [AAAM]; and (13) deferring $39,810,000 requested to develop DDG-51 flight III ships, based on the results of the major warship review; (14) adding $6,000,000 to enhance efforts by the Navy and the National Institutes of Health to expand the National Bone Marrow Donor Registry.

*Air Force.*—(1) Fully funding the intercontinental ballistic missile modernization request of $548,049,000 for the MX rail garrison system and $202,159,000 for the small ICBM; (2) maintaining the Advanced Strategic Missile Systems Program at the fiscal year 1990 level of $65,700,000, a decrease of $34,644,000 to the budget request; (3) approving $1,750,692,000 for development of the B-2 advanced technology bomber, an increase of $184,000,000 to the request; (4) fully funding the $52,307,000 requested for development of the advanced cruise missile variant; (5) deferring the $45,470,000 sought to begin development of a radar warning receiver for the B-1B bomber; (6) deferring the $33,138,000 requested for space surveillance technology to develop the Air Force candidate for a costly, new space-based wide-area surveillance system (the Navy's proposal for such a system also was deferred); (7) providing the full request of $541,082,000 for the C-17 advanced transport aircraft; (8) adjusting the advanced tactical fighter budget request as follows: (*a*) approving $870,364,000, an increase of $106,441,000, to extend the demonstration/validation phase of development; and (*b*) denying the $283,000,000 requested to begin full-scale development in fiscal year 1991; (9) denying the $158,000,000 requested for the national aerospace plane [NASP]; (10) including $36,759,000, an increase of $27,000,000, to continue development of the Tacit Rainbow loitering radar-killer missile; (11) providing $152,000,000 for the Defense Support Program Follow-on Competition/Boost Surveillance and Tracking System Program; this amount consists of $15,000,000 added to the Air Force request and $137,000,000 transferred by bill language from the strategic defense initiative; (12) eliminating the requested $744,164,000 for the Milstar satellite communications system and providing $20,000,000 for a Milstar alternative; (13) approving $140,483,000, a decrease of $92,000,000 to the request, for the joint surveillance/target attack radar system [JSTARS] and ordering an assessment of non-NATO scenarios for the program; (14) deferring: (*a*) $39,300,000 for upgrades to F-16 fighters and A-10 ground-attack aircraft until a new close air support [CAS] platform is selected; (*b*) $4,900,000 for a CAS-related F-16 avionics upgrade; and (*c*) $1,983,000 for A-10 CAS upgrades; and (15) providing $191,807,000, a reduction of $42,490,000 to the request for medium launch vehicles (space boosters) development.

*Defense agencies.*—(1) Adding $10,000,000 for a United States-Japan management training program at universities, colleges, or nonprofit institutions to study Japanese industry and technology management methods; (2) appropriating $128,000,000, an increase of $20,000,000 to the budget request, for high-performance computing activities in the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency [DARPA]; (3) adding funds for two important manufacturing technology programs: (*a*) $26,000,000 for a continuous fiber metal matrix composites initiative; and (*b*) $25,000,000 for the DARPA initiative on concurrent engineering [DICE]; (4) providing $170,000,000 for a consolidated industrial preparedness manufacturing technology program under OSD; these funds consist of resources transferred from the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Defense Logistics Agency and the addition of $18,420,000 to the budget request; (5) approving $3,573,000,000, the fiscal year 1990 funding level, for the strategic defense initiative [SDI]; bill language transfers $137,000,000 of boost surveillance tracking system [BSTS] funds to the Air Force; bill and report language allocates $42,000,000 to continue the United States-Israel joint program to develop the ARROW theater missile defense system; (6) including $20,000,000, an increase of $11,478,000 to the request, for the joint DOD-DOE Munitions Technology Development Program; (7) appropriating $148,000,000, the fiscal year 1990 level, for the air defense initiative; the action is $98,920,000 below the budget request; (8) funding $30,000,000 to continue the joint Nonacoustic Antisubmarine Warfare Program in OSD; (9) providing $162,687,000 for the balanced technology initiative [BTI], a reduction of $46,500,000 to the budget request, for this effort to develop advanced conventional war-fighting technologies; (10) fully funding the $95,781,000 budget request for joint development projects with major allies under the NATO research and development program; (11) creating an AIM-9 consolidated program for $30,000,000 to fund a Navy-Air Force effort to upgrade the Sidewinder air-to-air missile; (12) funding $30,000,000 for high definition television/display technologies research and development, an addition of $18,000,000 to the budget request; (13) directing that $50,000,000 of excess assets from the national defense stockpile transaction fund be available for a DARPA precompetitive technology development program; (14) providing $200,000,000 for the Strategic Environmental Research Program, a new initiative, to capitalize on the RDT&E capabilities of Defense Department laboratories to address environmental threats; (15) recommending $107,959,000, a reduction of $77,940,000 to the request, for the Test Instrumentation Development Program (renamed the Central Test and Evaluation Program [CTEIP]) under the Director of Test and Evaluation, Defense [DT&E]; recommending $95,842,000, a reduction of $23,768,000 to the budget request, for the Development Test and Evaluation Program element to support developmental testing; and (16) eliminating the $73,800,000 requested for the Capability Improvement Program [CIP] under the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation [OT&E]; three projects for a total of $23,050,000 are transferred to the previously mentioned CTEIP program to enhance operational testing.

## PRINCIPAL COMMITTEE OBSERVATIONS

### FEDERALLY FUNDED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTERS [FFRDC'S] AND CONSULTING SERVICES

The Committee is proposing two initiatives to reflect the overall retrenchment in defense spending, especially in the RDT&E infrastructure and general support categories. The first initiative would eliminate exorbitant growth in funding for defense federally funded research and development centers [FFRDC's]. The second action would reduce the total amount of funds spent by the Defense Department for consulting services. This latter endeavor parallels an initiative adopted by Congress for fiscal year 1990.

The Defense Department is requesting $1,625,990,000 to fund the activities of 10 FFRDC's during fiscal year 1991. Most of these funds are provided in the RDT&E accounts, both in specific program elements for some of the centers and through other program elements on a reimbursable basis. These FFRDC's provide engineering, technical, research, and analytical support to the Department. Their products range from hardware demonstrations (in a few cases) to paper studies and assessments (in most cases).

The Committee notes that in fiscal year 1985, when total military spending authority peaked, these FFRDC's received $1,012,710,000. Thus, since the high point for defense budgets, FFRDC funding still will experience 61-percent growth, if the new request is approved. Even excluding inflation, the total funding increase for these organizations would be almost 31 percent.

Since fiscal year 1985, the Committee observes that the personnel levels of the FFRDC's have increased steadily, as has the cost per professional staff-year in most cases. The fiscal year 1991 request anticipates even further growth in both these categories for most of the centers.

The Committee believes that further increases in defense FFRDC spending are unjustified, and that action must be taken to return this funding to a much more reasonable level. The FFRDC's and their employees should adjust to defense spending constraints—and to the likely contraction in the defense infrastructure—just as the Pentagon and its military and civilian personnel are required to do so.

To reverse the current situation, the Committee recommends reducing total funding next fiscal year for these FFRDC's to the fiscal year 1987 level, adjusted for inflation. Fiscal year 1987 was the high point for defense RDT&E funding in the last decade and the Committee thinks this is a more acceptable level of support for the FFRDC's than the amount requested for fiscal year 1991. The Committee's recommendation would save $197,230,000 from the budget request.

In each of the defense RDT&E accounts, the Committee recommends specific reductions for each FFRDC. These reductions are discussed in the appropriate sections of this chapter. Although for accounting purposes, the decreases are assessed against RDT&E program elements and funding, the Committee intends that they be applied against total fiscal year 1991 budget requests for each of the FFRDC's.

The Defense Department is directed to implement the reductions in the RDT&E accounts, and in any other appropriations accounts as necessary, so as to achieve the total, specific decreases recommended for each FFRDC. The Department also is directed to provide the Committees on Appropriations with identification of the individual program elements, projects, and other budget line items affected by these reductions, within 90 days after enactment of the fiscal year 1991 appropriations measure.

The Committee's second initiative recognizes that the private sector consultant community also should bear its share of the burden of accommodating defense budget constraints. These consultants provide many of the same services as the FFRDC's.

The Defense Department proposes to spend at least $1,485,000,000 for consulting services next fiscal year—a sum which most observers believe substantially understates the amount the Pentagon actually spends annually for consultants. The Committee recommends that this amount be decreased by $180,000,000, which is patterned after a reduction imposed on consulting services in fiscal year 1990.

The Committee proposes a general provision which implements this reduction and sets a limit of $1,305,000,000 for such services in fiscal year 1991. The provision repeats, with modified dollar amounts, section 9064 of the Defense Appropriations Act, 1990. This reduction applies to all appropriations accounts.

## SPACE-BASED WIDE AREA SURVEILLANCE PROGRAMS

The Committee remains concerned about the premature, costly, and duplicative nature of the space-based wide area surveillance programs being proposed by the Navy and the Air Force. The Committee recommends denying the requests for these programs, based on the extensive rationale set forth in the classified annex to this report. In addition, the Committee is recommending a general provision which statutorily prohibits the obligation and expenditure of any Federal funds for these programs during fiscal year 1991. The Committee has found it necessary to recommend such legislation since the restrictions imposed in report language for fiscal year 1990 were not adhered to by the Department of Defense.

## RDT&E REPROGRAMMING ISSUES

The Committee is aware of instances in which Department of Defense components have planned or implemented below-threshold reprogramming actions in the RDT&E accounts to begin new programs or to undertake costly, major additions to existing programs. There also have been instances in which two below-threshold reprogramming actions, each involving funds from different fiscal years, have been combined to fund programs at an amount exceeding the limit for a single below-threshold reprogramming. The Committee firmly believes these practices violate either the letter or the spirit, or both, of the established reprogramming procedures.

Accordingly, the Committee directs the following changes in established reprogramming procedures for RDT&E funds: (*a*) no major modification (of an existing program) for which funds were not approved by Congress in the original appropriations measure for the fiscal year in which the modification is to begin is permissible without prior endorsement by the congressional defense committees through action on a formal, prior approval reprogramming request; (*b*) prior approval through the formal reprogramming process must be obtained from the congressional defense committees for any reallocation of funds upward or downward which involves the combination of two below-threshold reprogrammings using funds from different fiscal years; (*c*) the maximum cumulative limit for below-threshold reprogramming from any separate program, project, or activity is $4,000,000 or 20 percent of the funds appropriated for that endeavor in the fiscal year in which the below-threshold reprogramming is to occur, whichever is the lesser amount.

The Committee hopes these changes will address satisfactorily the current situation. Continuation of the questionable practices by the Defense Department will necessitate complete elimination of below-threshold reprogramming flexibility.

## RDT&E INFRASTRUCTURE AND GENERAL SUPPORT PROGRAMS

As discussed previously, the Committee found it necessary to maintain at the fiscal year 1990 level the fiscal year 1991 funding for most RDT&E infrastructure and general support programs. The Committee directs that no single installation should be allocated a disproportionate share of any reduction made to any specific program element in these categories.

### INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT OF MAJOR PROGRAMS

The Congress recognizes that the Department of Defense has been investing heavily in stealthy combat systems, including the B-2, F-117, and Air Force and Navy versions of the advanced tactical fighter [ATF] and advanced tactical aircraft [ATA]. The Congress also recognizes that there are significant costs associated with the stealth characteristics of these systems. If these characteristics enhance operations as promised, potential adversaries will try to develop countermeasures. The Congress also recognizes the possibility of other countries developing or acquiring their own stealthy combat systems, making it necessary for the United States to be able to counter those threats.

At the direction of the Congress, the Secretary of Defense has provided for an ongoing independent assessment of the capabilities and performance of the B-2 aircraft. The Congress is aware that the Secretary of Defense has initiated similar assessments for the other stealthy combat systems (except for the F-117) as well as examinations of the counterstealth capabilities of certain Army and Navy air defense systems. The Congress believes these additional assessments should be conducted in an independent and objective manner. Accordingly, the Committee directs that the Secretary of Defense shall pattern the ongoing assessments of the Air Force and Navy versions of the ATF and A-12/ATA and Army and Navy air defense systems after the B-2 assessment, providing for the same degree of independence and reporting schedule to the Congress. Moreover, the Secretary of Defense shall include a comparison of the F-117 program as a baseline.

## RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $5,354,508,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 6,025,900,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 5,299,793,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $5,299,793,000, a reduction of $726,107,000 to the budget request.

### SUMMARY TABLE

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget estimate | Committee recommendation | Change from budget |
|---|---|---|---|
| Technology base | 768,884 | 818,301 | +49,417 |
| Advanced technology development | 485,043 | 408,497 | −76,546 |
| Strategic programs | 296,050 | 180,641 | −115,409 |
| Tactical programs | 3,059,672 | 2,568,980 | −490,692 |
| Intelligence and communications | 95,399 | 74,399 | −21,000 |
| Defensewide mission support | 1,320,852 | 1,248,975 | −71,877 |

The budget activities and programs funded under this appropriation are discussed below.

### CLASSIFIED PROGRAM ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommends the following adjustments to classified programs, as explained in the classified annex to the Committee's report:

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget estimate | Committee recommendation | Compared with budget estimate |
|---|---|---|---|
| Survivability enhancement | 6,285 | 11,285 | +5,000 |
| Armament enhancement initiative | | (+21,380) | (+21,380) |
| Tractor pull | 35,149 | 45,149 | +10,000 |
| Tractor trailer | | 5,200 | +5,200 |
| Special programs | | | −65,709 |
| Surface-to-surface missile rocket system | 47,175 | 24,908 | −22,267 |

### MANAGEMENT SUPPORT, OVERHEAD, AND INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAMS

Consistent with the adjustments already approved by the Senate, the Committee recommends the following overhead and infrastructure programs be reduced to fiscal year 1990 levels. To facilitate greater management flexibility, base operations, and real property maintenance are consolidated in a single program element.

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget estimate | Committee recommendation | Compared with budget estimate |
|---|---|---|---|
| Army test ranges and facilities | 229,891 | 220,000 | −9,891 |
| Army technical test instrumentation and targets | 88,484 | 75,000 | −13,484 |
| Meteorological support to RDT&E activities | 24,395 | 23,138 | −1,257 |
| Programwide activities | 93,249 | 88,889 | −4,360 |
| Technical information activities | 7,658 | 5,858 | −1,800 |
| Base operations/real property maintenance | 427,124 | 390,736 | −36,388 |
| Management headquarters | 15,297 | 14,458 | −839 |

### ADJUSTMENTS BASED ON POOR FINANCIAL EXECUTION IN FISCAL YEAR 1990

Several programs are recommended for adjustment based on their poor financial execution in fiscal year 1990. The Committee's recommendation recognizes that the Army's inability to maintain program and disbursement schedules for programs in fiscal year 1990 prevents execution at the spending levels anticipated in the fiscal year 1991 budget request:

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget estimate | Committee recommendation | Compared with budget estimate |
|---|---|---|---|
| Advanced field artillery tactical data system | 45,764 | 40,764 | −5,000 |
| Other missile product improvement programs | 73,320 | 68,320 | −5,000 |

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget estimate | Committee recommendation | Compared with budget estimate |
|---|---|---|---|
| SATCOM ground environment (Non-MILSTAR) | 47,744 | 42,744 | −5,000 |
| Army data distribution system | 21,701 | 14,701 | −7,000 |
| Combat service support computer system evaluation | 11,193 | 9,193 | −2,000 |
| Aircraft weapons | 7,607 | 5,607 | −2,000 |

## ADDITIONAL MAJOR PROGRAM ADJUSTMENTS AND SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS

The Committee recommends the following adjustments to the budget request, along with recommendations and observations about several special interest items:

*In-house laboratory independent research and development.*—The Committee recommends $8,946,000 for this program element to provide Army laboratory directors with discretionary funds for meritorious research projects arising during the fiscal year. The reduction of $483,000 to the budget request is made because the defense research and development establishment is expected to contract significantly to accommodate likely budget constraints.

*Defense research sciences.*—The Committee recommends an appropriation of $171,490,000, a reduction of $8,000,000 from the budget request for this technology base program element. The recommendation denies the Army funds to undertake two, below threshold reprogrammings to initiate a small satellite/launch vehicle development program. Such an effort would duplicate efforts already underway in the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency [DARPA]. The Committee directs that no funds available to the Army during fiscal year 1991 may be used to support any Lightsat activities separate from the DARPA program.

*Electronic survivability and fuzing technology.*—The Committee recommends $26,897,000, an increase of $2,000,000, to enhance research to protect U.S. fuzes against countermeasures.

*Missile technology.*—The Committee recommends an increase of $5,000,000 to be used only for the development of an advanced kinetic energy missile [ADKEM] that uses a front-end millimeter seeker. These funds are not intended to be used for range improvements.

*Weapons and munitions technology.*—As explained in the Committee's discussion of the block III tank, the Committee recommends an increase of $10,000,000 for electrothermal gun research and development.

Within the remaining $36,866,000 recommended for this program element, $750,000 shall be available only to continue research and development on coatings for wooden pallets and containers that would enable them to meet the Army's current requirements for nuclear, biological, and chemical decontaminability. The funds should be used both to improve coatings which showed promise during the initial phase of the research and to examine additional coatings and technologies.

*Electronics and electronic devices.*—An increase of $2,500,000 is recommended to enhance the development of battery technology. Of this increase, $900,000 is to be used for magnesium alternatives to the family of lithium batteries; $350,000 is to develop low to no mercury batteries to meet Department of Defense alkaline and zinc/carbon battery performance requirements and $350,000 is intended to develop, evaluate, and qualify MK-132 naval mine batteries using 3000-HC cells; $400,000 is for feasibility of recycling and reclaiming cadmium/mercury cells and batteries. Finally, $500,000 is to select, study, and build prototypes for a safe lithium-like battery system for improved performance, size reduction, and reduction of battery proliferation.

*Night vision technology.*—The Committee recommends $20,285,000, an increase of $1,000,000, to enhance development of algorithms used in night targeting systems.

*Environmental quality technology.*—The Committee recommends $14,715,000, an increase of $4,900,000; $1,900,000 of this increase is to enhance development of alternatives to open burning and detonation of obsolete rounds and waste propellants, and research on incineration of paint waste. A total of $2,900,000 is provided for the Army's Natick Research, Development and Engineering Center for the development of biodegradable plastic using starch-based polymer technology. This increase is intended to be used by the Army to assist the Navy with the control of disposing of plastic wastes at sea. Finally, $100,000 is included to initiate safety, population risk, and environmental assessments of the White Sands missile range near Las Cruces, NM, to demonstrate the safety and feasibility of the land recovery of unmanned reentry capsules from orbit.

*Medical technology and medical advanced technology.*—The Committee recommends funding of $101,902,000 for medical technology programs and $39,809,000 for medical advanced technology. This represents an increase of $5,000,000 for each program. This increase is provided to enhance the Army's basic and advanced research into tropical infectious diseases such as malaria and dengue fever.

In taking this action, the Committee takes note of the significant contributions that the Army's Military Infectious Disease Research Program, and in particular the Army's tropical medicine research, have made over the past decades. While the primary mission of the Army's tropical medicine program is to protect U.S. military personnel throughout the world, the program also provides significant spinoff benefits to both the overall U.S. population and medical community. For example, the Army's program not only has been a vital source of training U.S. research scientists, but also has trained foreign research scientists from the developing countries in which Department of Defense medical research units have operated.

The need for new and better defenses and weapons against tropical diseases has never been greater. Age-old diseases such as malaria have developed new defense mechanisms against current drugs and control mechanisms. There is inadequate surveillance for early detection and control of newly emerging tropical infectious agents. The rapidity and volume of international travel has allowed for the introduction of fatal hemorrhagic disease into the Americas, where the insect vectors are well established.

The Army's recent focus on deployability and low-intensity conflict should require a renewed concern for combating the diseases that U.S. personnel could encounter under such scenarios. The Committee's recommended funding increases should assist with initiating or enhancing specific tropical medicine research projects.

*Magnetoencephalography [MEG].*—The Committee recognizes the valuable contribution of the Army Research Institute to the joint Department of Energy, Veterans Administration, and academic research effort on magnetoencephalography. The Committee is encouraged by the progress being made in this technology, which will increase our understanding of the human brain, and expects the Department of the Army, within available funds, to continue its participation in this joint research effort.

*Aviation advanced technology.*—This program element funds the Army's development of advanced helicopter and other aviation-related technologies. In recognition of the expected contraction of defense research activities due to budget constraints, the Committee recommends $32,713,000 for these activities in fiscal year 1991. The recommended reduction of $2,000,000 is against the integrated high performance turbine engine technology program [IHPTET]. This long-term, and lower priority, research program is held to the fiscal year 1990 level. Similar recommendations are included in the Navy and Air Force RDT&E accounts for the IHPTET projects funded by those services.

The Committee also directs that none of the funds contained in this Army program element may be obligated or expended until the Office of the Secretary of Defense submits to Congress a specific timetable, including obligation dates and programmatic milestones, for implementing the advanced rotorcraft vectored thrust combat agility demonstrator project. This project was mandated by Congress in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1990, and funded in the NATO research and development program element in the "Defense agencies" account. The Committee understands that the Army has been assigned the responsibility to implement this project and expects the service to do so without further delay.

*Chemical/biological defense.*—The Army's research and development budget requests $283,800,000 for chemical/biological defense. These funds are requested in a number of program elements and projects for various initiatives.

During the last year the United States and Soviet Union have made tremendous progress toward banning offensive chemical and biological weapons. The Committee's recommendations in procurement of ammunition reflect these changes. Unfortunately, current events in the Persian Gulf underscore the fact that chemical weapons continue to present a very real threat to United States forces. These events underscore the importance of enhancing defensive measures against such chemical and biological weapons.

The Committee recommends an increase of $50,000,000 for chemical/biological defense research and development programs. The Army's highest priority should be accorded to the rapid development and fielding of lightweight protective clothing. An increase of

$15,000,000 is provided to logistics technology (clothing and equipment) for this purpose. The Committee recommends an increase of $7,500,000 for medical technology (medical biological chemical defense) and $7,500,000 for medical advanced technology (medical biological defense vaccines and drugs) for development of antidotes to chemical agents and development of vaccines against such biological threats as anthrax. An increase of $20,000,000 is recommended chemical/biological defense equipment (advanced development and engineering development) for equipment, personal, and vehicle decontamination systems and integration of nuclear, biological, and chemical survivability enhancements for a number of Army systems.

Further direction with respect to this Committee initiative is contained in the classified annex to this report.

*AFAS advanced development.*—The Committee recommends $21,800,000 for development of propellants for the advanced field artillery system [AFAS], an increase of $18,000,000 to the budget request. To provide appropriate visibility for this program, a new program element has been created for AFAS advanced development.

The Committee believes that the Army needs to assign higher priority to the development of new artillery technologies. Within the armored systems modernization program, the Army should give priority to developing a new self-propelled artillery system rather than a new main battle tank. While it is commonly regarded as the king of the battlefield, field artillery development has not received the attention accorded by the Soviet Union to this family of weapons system. And, it has lagged behind the level of attention accorded by the U.S. Army to other combat arms.

The leading edge technology that will drive the development of any new artillery system will be the selection of a propellant. Extended range and increased rate of fire requires new propulsion technologies. The Army is currently developing two competing technologies—liquid propellant and a more conventional solid propellant called unicharge. These two propellants require different firing mechanisms, logistics systems, and manufacturing facilities.

Selecting between these competing propellants will require additional research and time. To enhance the Army's current effort to mature these propellants and to ensure that the best decision is made for the next generation of field artillery, the Committee has added $18,000,000 to the budget request.

Finally, if the Army is to become a lighter, more mobile force, development of a modernized towed, not self-propelled, 155 mm artillery system with unicharge or liquid propellant should be accorded priority. The Committee would support the Army's use of a portion of the $18,000,000 increase for this purpose.

*Block III tank.*—The armored system modernization [ASM] program, formerly called the heavy forces modernization program, is designed to develop a series of armored vehicles to meet a projected Soviet armored threat in Central Europe. The Army has structured the program to be driven by the tank application, called the block III tank, which would replace the current M–1 series.

The budget request essentially terminates production of M–1 series tanks. The M–1A2 program was allowed to complete development, but production was halted at 62 tanks that would, in turn, be scattered throughout the Army as test vehicles. The budget also proposes $176,761,000 for development of the new block III tank, of which $113,000,000 is allocated for what was forecast to be the second year of a chassis contract. Further, the budget underfunds alternative propulsion and ammunition technologies, since the Army has already decided that the new block III main battle tank should possess a conventional 140 mm gun. Thus, in total, the budget proposes forgoing upgrades to current systems in order to proceed with a future tank scheduled for deployment in the late 1990's.

The Committee does not approve the ASM program as structured in the budget and does not support the decision to proceed now with the block III tank. Accordingly, a $113,000,000 reduction is recommended.

The Committee action is based on several factors. First, the Committee believes that there is no compelling reason to proceed with development of the block III tank at this time given changes in the Soviet threat. Second, the Committee does not agree with the decision to write off upgrades to the current tank fleet. The Committee has funded $90,700,000 to continue development of the M-1A2 tank and (as described in the "Procurement" section of this report) supports upgrading the current fleet of M-1 tanks with a 120 mm gun. Third, as noted earlier, the Committee believes that the Army's top priority in the ASM program should be the development of field artillery, which will be paced by the maturation of propellants. The first chassis developed by the ASM program should be optimized for the AFAS, not for the block III tank.

Most importantly, the Army needs to develop lighter, lethal, more deployable tanks rather than building yet another main battle tank weighing 60 to 70 tons. Realistically, the block III tank will be a 70-ton tank that will take weeks to months to reach any potential battlefield.

The Committee's recommendations emphasize, instead, fundamental technology developments for the next generation of tanks and ammunition improvements to upgrade the lethality of the M-1 series. The Committee has added $12,000,000 for development of electrothermal chemical and electromagnetic gun technologies and solid-state switches and capacitors required for this technology. The Committee also recommends an increase of $15,000,000 to initiate development of a 120 mm rocket assisted kinetic energy [RAKE] program within the armament enhancement initiative program. As discussed above, an increase of $18,000,000 has been allocated to the AFAS program to facilitate the selection of a new artillery propellant to accelerate development of the advanced field artillery system.

Finally, within the combat vehicle and automotive advanced technology program, the Committee has provided $63,729,000 to continue research and development of propulsion, vehicle tracks, survivability, and electronics.

*HIV research and vaccine development.*—The Committee is pleased that for the first time the budget requests funding for HIV research. This action indicates that the Army recognizes the unique threats posed by the HIV and acquired immune deficiency syndrome [AIDS] to military personnel.

The critical importance of the Army's HIV research program takes on added importance when considering: the military's unique requirements for blood supplies; the need to use local supplies of blood when casualties exceed 10 percent; the proliferation of AIDS worldwide; and the military's higher incidence of venereal infections in comparison with the general population during both peacetime and wartime.

The Army's HIV research program, unlike that of the Department of Health and Human Services, focuses on development of a vaccine for individuals not yet infected by the HIV. The Army's vaccine development has made significant progress, and first stage testing of one candidate vaccine has been extremely promising.

Unfortunately, the budget request for HIV research represents a 33-percent reduction from fiscal year 1990 appropriated levels, and ignores the program's fiscal year 1991 program schedule and requirements. Accordingly, the Committee recommendation fully funds the fiscal year 1991 program at $44,558,000, an increase of $22,000,000 to the budget request, with a priority placed on development and testing of vaccines.

*Directed energy [ASAT].*—This program element funds the development of antisatellite [ASAT]-related technologies for the Army's ground-based free electron laser, which is part of the strategic defense initiative [SDI]. The Committee recommends $25,000,000, a reduction of $16,014,000 to the budget request. The recommendation decreases the budget request to reflect program delays and to make fiscal year 1991 funding more consistent with the lower spending profile expected for this program in the near future. Delays in SDI and future budget limits have prompted OSD to change significantly the overall strategy for selecting among candidate laser ASAT technologies. Since submission of the budget request, this selection has been delayed 3 to 4 years, and outyear funding for this program element is to be reduced.

*Antisatellite weapon [ASAT].*—This program element funds development of kinetic energy (nonlaser) weapons to threaten low-Earth-orbit Soviet satellites, especially those aiding the targeting of United States forces, and to deter Soviet ASAT threats against United States national security-related satellites. Land-based interceptor rockets and associated command, control, and communications elements will be developed. The Committee recommends $158,082,000, a reduction of $49,700,000 from the budget request. These funds were identified by the Army as available due to savings obtained in award of a full-scale engineering development contract.

*Medium surface-to-air missile [MSAM].*—The Committee denies the $6,898,000 requested to begin a new start program to develop a follow-on air defense missile to the current HAWK system. Initiation of this costly program is premature because HAWK product improvements are only just being fielded. The program also lacks a firm organization and operational plan and specific identification of threats it is to counter. The affordability of MSAM should be addressed next year within the context of the constrained, fiscal years 1992–97 budget environment.

The Committee further understands that the Defense Acquisition Board [DAB] has directed the Army to aggressively solicit cost sharing with allies for development of MSAM, which also is designated the corps surface-to-air missile [CORPSAM]. The DAB also directed OSD to assess, within the next 6 months, the applicability and contributions to the MSAM program of the Army's joint tactical missile defense program and of the strategic defense initiative's theater missile defense program. The recommended deferral of the fiscal year 1991 request will permit Congress to consider the results of the Army's pursuit of development cost sharing and of OSD's review of the ballistic missile defense programs. The Committee directs OSD to report on these results with submission of next year's budget request.

*Weapons and munitions advanced development.*—The Committee recommends $7,211,000, a reduction of $11,355,000 to the budget request for this program element which develops advanced technologies to improve Army fire support and soldier-carried weapons and munitions. The Committee reduction includes the following elements: a $3,000,000 decrease associated with the now canceled Mark 19 grenade launcher improvement program; a $995,000 decrease to the common infrared seeker; and a $7,300,000 reduction in the block II project for the Army tactical missile system [ATACMS].

Since submitting the budget request, the Army has terminated the Mark 19 improvement project and has no intention of spending the $1,500,000 allocated for this effort in fiscal year 1990 and an equal amount sought for fiscal year 1991. The Committee intends that the fiscal 1990 funds be used to support other activities in this program element in fiscal 1991. Fuller rationale for the other recommended reductions is contained in the classified annex to this report.

*Armed AHIP.*—The Committee recommends no funding for the armed Army helicopter improvement program [AHIP]. The budget proposes to spend $25,817,000 to integrate Hellfire missiles on the OH-58D helicopter.

The Committee has included $315,000,000 for the light helicopter in fiscal year 1991 and anticipates fully supporting this program in the future. The light helicopter, not the armed AHIP, will provide the survivability and lethality desired by the Army for the armed reconnaissance role. The armed AHIP will not survive in either a high- or low-threat environment. Further, since the Army's aviation modernization program calls for retiring armed AHIP's as the LH is fielded, armed AHIP merely presents a short-term solution. Therefore, the Army's $25,817,000 request is denied.

*Light armed scout helicopter.*—The Committee has fully funded the rephased light helicopter [LH] program (formerly called LHX), that emphasizes a fly-before-buy development strategy. The Committee recommends $315,000,000 for continuing the demonstration/validation phase for the LH and the T800 engine. This represents a reduction of $150,000,000 from the budget request.

Under the rephased LH program as recently approved by the Secretary of Defense, the Army will select a winning contractor team by February 1991 and will proceed with the development and testing of three prototypes. This schedule extends demonstration/

validation by 2 years to ensure that the aircraft that enters full-scale development truly meets the needs of U.S. land forces.

The Committee recognizes the need to modernize the Army's aging fleet of AH-1 and OH-58A/C light attack helicopters with the LH. If the U.S. Air Force would have been restricted to the same level of aviation modernization and technology as the U.S. Army, it's force structure would now be made up by older models of the F-4 Phantom rather than by F-16 and F-15 aircraft.

The Committee believes that the LH is precisely the type of program that the Army should be investing in if it is to become lighter, more mobile, and more lethal. LH will be deployed with light divisions while Apache helicopters will not. LH will have night and all-weather capabilities in both hot and cold temperatures and has been designed with significant lethality and survivability.

*Advanced tank cannon system.*—The Committee recommends a reduction of $46,337,000 denying full-scale development of the 140 mm XM291 main tank gun and ammunition. There is no need to proceed with development of a large 140 mm gun, which is designed for the block III tank. As noted in the Senate Armed Services Committee report accompanying S. 2884: "Proceeding with full-scale development (of the advanced tank cannon system) will lock the Army into conventional gun technologies at the expense of more promising advanced technologies." The Committee fully concurs and observes that the development of such ammunition would reduce the number of rounds that a tank could carry. This large ammunition would burden the existing logistics system and would again reduce the buying power of a constrained ammunition procurement budget by increasing unit costs.

*Close combat tactical trainer/SIMNET.*—The Committee recommends $7,500,000 for development of close combat tactical trainers [CCCT] for the Army National Guard and Reserve. The budget did not request funding for this program.

The CCCT builds upon the Defense Advanced Research Project Agency's SIMNET-distributed simulation system. This simulation enables Army combat units to train through interactive war gaming while at different locations. The Committee's action is intended to accelerate Army actions to develop and deploy CCCT simulators for the Reserve components.

*Air defense command, control, and intelligence.*—The Committee recommends a reduction of $40,000,000 for the forward area air defense command and control [FAAD $C^2$] program.

Since the fiscal year 1991 budget was submitted, the FAAD $C^2$ program has been significantly restructured. The budget contemplates a program designed for heavy divisions that relies on a ground-based sensor and assumes procurement and deployment of the ADATS (air defense antitank system). The ground based sensor has since been terminated by the administration and ADATS has been terminated by the Senate.

The Army is now in the process of tailoring the FAAD $C^2$ system for light divisions, which have fewer air defense weapons systems and would use a light, deployable radar.

The program delays and rephasing related to this decision result in $30,000,000 of the FAAD $C^2$ request being excess to fiscal year 1991 requirements. In addition, the Committee recommendation assumes that $10,000,000 of unobligated fiscal year 1990 RDT&E appropriations for the FAAD ground sensor will be reapplied to FAAD C$^2$ fiscal year 1991 efforts.

*Electronic warfare [EW] development.*—The Committee recommends a reduction of $6,306,000 to the classified budget request for this program to develop electronic warfare capabilities for Army aircraft and other weapons systems. The recommendation adds $10,600,000 for the TACJAM-A project and defers funds for several expensive, complex, premature projects which lack firm fielding dates, or requirement documents, or specific identification of platforms upon which the systems are to be installed. The Committee questions the urgency of these projects, since the Army's newest helicopter development programs—the LH and the special operations aircraft—already include sophisticated EW systems. The deferred projects also should be required to compete against other Army priorities within the constrained fiscal years 1992–97 defense spending plan.

The addition for the TACJAM project represents the amount required to eliminate an expected funding shortfall at the planned expenditure rate, and to fund scheduled work on contract.

The projects recommended for deferral are: advanced threat radar jammer (−$8,000,000); advanced threat infrared countermeasures (−$4,900,000); advanced integrated aircraft survivability equipment (−$1,000,000); and optical countermeasure (−$3,000,000). The optical countermeasure project duplicates an effort in the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency [DARPA]. In addition, the Army's last project in this area failed due to cost and technology concerns. The Committee directs the Army to cooperate with DARPA to adapt that agency's optical countermeasures project to meet Army aircraft and vehicle needs. Similar recommendations are being made with respect to optical countermeasure projects under development by the Navy and the Air Force.

*Joint surveillance/target attack radar system [JSTARS].*—This program element funds the Army's development of the ground station modules to receive and disseminate targeting information obtained by the Air Force's JSTARS radar aircraft. It also funds the proposed upgrade to the small aerostat surveillance system [SASS]. The Committee recommends $35,833,000 for fiscal year 1991, a reduction of $10,200,000 to the budget request.

The recommendation denies $2,600,000 for integrating the JSTARS ground station module into the heavy, electronic fighting vehicle system chassis. The Committee believes the Army should integrate the JSTARS module only into the lighter, more rapidly deployable high mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicle chassis. Integration of the ground station module into a heavy chassis contradicts the Army's new emphasis on developing lighter, more deployable forces. In addition, the recommendation deletes $7,600,000 to upgrade the SASS—a reduction already approved by the full Senate. The SASS upgrade no longer is needed since the Committee has recommended continued funding in the drug interdiction account to procure and operate unmanned aerial vehicles for Southern Command missions.

*Chemical systems engineering development.*—Consistent with the adjustment in the Senate-passed Defense authorization bill, the Committee recommends a reduction of $27,806,000 which terminates development of the multiple launch rocket system [MLRS] chemical round.

*Longbow.*—Consistent with the adjustment in the Senate-passed Defense authorization bill, the Committee recommends $171,514,000 for the Longbow program. The reduction of $48,000,000 is to be taken from the Longbow fire control and radar development. No reductions are recommended to the Apache Longbow modification program.

To facilitate review of the entire Longbow program in the future, a new consolidated program element is created.

*LOSAT.*—The Committee fully supports the development of the line-of-sight antitank [LOSAT] that employs the kinetic energy missile [KEM]. This promising technology provides significant lethality and could revolutionize armored warfare by putting any armored vehicle at risk. However, the budget request anticipated a maturing of this technology that would enable full-scale development to proceed in March 1991. This has not been the case. To date, only two KEM tests have successfully hit a target.

The Committee recommends a reduction of $42,000,000 related to program delays. The Committee has provided $52,881,000 to continue testing of the KEM and to maintain the contractor work force for this program.

*Follow-on Lance engineering development.*—The Committee recommends a reduction of $112,228,000 for follow-on Lance development. Since submission of the budget, the administration has terminated this program.

*Soldier/marine enhancement program.*—Consistent with the adjustment in the Senate-passed Defense authorization bill, the Committee recommends an increase of $18,000,000 to improve equipment available for infantrymen.

*Tacit Rainbow.*—The Committee recommends $102,700,000 for this program to develop a ground-launched version of the Air Force's aircraft-delivered, loitering missile designed to attack air defense radar systems. The reduction to the budget request eliminates $2,558,000 the Army identified as excess to fiscal year 1991 funding requirements.

*Kwajalein Atoll.*—The Committee recommends fully funding the Army's $180,033,000 budget request for the maintenance and operation of the United States Army-Kwajalein Atoll [USAKA]. In taking this action and not agreeing with reductions proposed by other oversight committees. the Committee recognizes the close, integral relationship between USAKA and the Republic of the Marshall Islands. Approximately 11,000 Marshallese citizens live within the atoll and 1,000 Marshallese work for the Army.

The Committee takes note of the fine progress the Army has made in improving relations with this new island nation. The creation of an Army civic action team or CAT team is a significant good faith effort to assist the Marshallese with development in the Kwajalein Atoll and in the outer atolls and islands of the Marshall Islands.

This cooperation needs to continue. Accordingly, the Committee directs that $500,000 of the $180,033,000 appropriated be used only for projects to assist the Marshallese with their efforts to improve living conditions on Ebeye and Gugeegue Islands. A list of small, short-term projects should be developed jointly by USAKA, the Marshallese Government, and the Kwajalein Atoll Development Association.

*Laboratory relocation.*—The Committee is aware of plans for the fragmentation and relocation of the Army Materials Technology Laboratory from Watertown, MA, to sites at three other existing Army installations. Such a move would likely result in the technical decline of the laboratory as a major scientific entity and national asset. While the Base Closure Commission report mandates the sale of the land and facilities at the Watertown Arsenal, it certainly did not intend that the Army Materials Technology Laboratory be eliminated as a functioning, high performance scientific unit.

The Army is considering several alternatives to maintain the laboratory as an integrated research unit. The Committee encourages the Army to continue its discussions with the university community regarding possible placement of the facility in a university research park setting. This type of environment has proven effective in the past for housing research facilities within the Army research complex. Accordingly, the Committee expects a report from the Army not later than February 15, 1991, regarding the alternative for siting the Army Materials Technology Laboratory in a university research park environment.

*Arroyo Center.*—The Committee recommends a new program element in the "Army RDT&E" account for the Arroyo Center, a federally funded research and development center [FFRDC] operated by the Rand Corp. The recommendation transfers funding responsibility for the Arroyo Center from the "Operation and maintenance, Army" account to make the service's financing mechanism for this activity consistent with the research and development funding of other Rand FFRDC's in the Air Force and Defense agencies. Consistent with its actions toward the other federally funded research and development centers, as explained in the introduction to the RDT&E section, the Committee recommendation here limits the Arroyo Center to $22,850,000 for fiscal year 1991. The recommended amount is $3,150,000 below the budget request. The decrease represents the Arroyo Center's share of an action to reduce total defense FFRDC funding to the fiscal year 1987 level, as adjusted for inflation. Fiscal year 1987 was the peak year of defense RDT&E funding during the last decade. Further direction regarding this FFRDC reduction is provided in the RDT&E introduction.

*Industrial preparedness.*—As already approved by the Senate, the Committee recommends transferring $26,708,000 requested by the Army for manufacturing technology development to a new, consolidated program element under the auspices of OSD. Similar recommendations are made with respect to the Navy, Air Force, and Defense Logistics Agency manufacturing technology program elements. Further direction regarding items of Committee special interest in this joint program is contained in the "Defense Agencies RDT&E" section of the report.

*High mobility artillery rocket system.*—As U.S. attention turns increasingly toward our national interests outside the NATO arena, the Committee believes it is important for our military forces to be equipped with weapons suitable for contingency operations elsewhere in the world, such as Operation Desert Shield in the Middle East. The Committee notes that the Army has solicited comments from industry on a draft operational and organization plan for a high mobility artillery rocket system [HIMARS] for the MLRS family of munitions. HIMARS would be a highly mobile, light weight, and versatile rocket artillery system which could provide both short- and long-range firepower from the very beginning of a conflict. The Committee has received testimony that the Marines are also interested in such a system.

To meet the constraints of the current fiscal climate, the HIMARS program should make maximum use of existing resources and technology. The relatively small quantities projected for this program suggest that a low-risk program with minimal acquisition and life cycle costs would be most suitable. Accordingly, the Committee encourages the Army to request funding for HIMARS in the 1992 budget and fully expects the Army to move expeditiously into technology demonstration with the goal of deploying a system by the mid-1990's for both Army light forces and the Marine Corps.

[In thousands of dollars]

|  | Budget estimate | Committee recommendation | Senate compared with budget estimate |
|---|---|---|---|
| RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL ARMY |  |  |  |
| TECHNOLOGY BASE |  |  |  |
| IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH | 9,429 | 8,946 | -483 |
| DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES | 179,490 | 171,490 | -8,000 |
| MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY | 13,276 | 13,276 | --- |
| ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY AND FUZING TECHNOLOGY | 24,897 | 26,897 | +2,000 |
| SURVIVABILITY ENHANCEMENT | 6,285 | 11,285 | +5,000 |
| AVIATION TECHNOLOGY | 41,897 | 41,897 | --- |
| MISSILE TECHNOLOGY | 27,153 | 32,153 | +5,000 |
| LASER WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY | 559 | 559 | --- |
| COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY | 36,084 | 36,084 | --- |
| BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY | 27,700 | 27,700 | --- |
| CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECHNOLOGY | 50,841 | 50,841 | --- |
| JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM | 5,381 | 5,381 | --- |
| WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY | 36,866 | 46,866 | +10,000 |
| ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES | 17,608 | 20,108 | +2,500 |
| NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY | 19,285 | 20,285 | +1,000 |
| HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY | 8,019 | 8,019 | --- |
| ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY | 9,815 | 14,715 | +4,900 |
| NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICE TECHNOLOGY | 3,607 | 3,607 | --- |
| COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY | 20,458 | 20,458 | --- |
| COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY | 5,073 | 5,073 | --- |
| MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY | 46,053 | 46,053 | --- |
| MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY | 17,331 | 17,331 | --- |
| LOGISTICS TECHNOLOGY | 35,811 | 50,811 | +15,000 |
| MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY | 96,902 | 109,402 | +12,500 |
| TRACTOR FLOP | 1,863 | 1,863 | --- |
| CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 27,201 | 27,201 | --- |
| TOTAL, TECHNOLOGY BASE | 768,884 | 818,301 | +49,417 |
| ADVANCE TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT |  |  |  |
| LOGISTICS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 9,063 | 9,063 | --- |
| MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 34,809 | 47,309 | +12,500 |
| AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 34,713 | 32,713 | -2,000 |
| WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 33,471 | 29,671 | -3,800 |
| AFAS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT | --- | 21,800 | +21,800 |
| COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 176,761 | 63,729 | -113,032 |
| COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 9,334 | 9,334 | --- |
| HUMAN FACTORS/PERSONNEL/TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 19,008 | 19,008 | --- |
| CLASSIFIED PROGRAM | 6,382 | 6,382 | --- |
| TRACTOR HOLE | 4,656 | 4,656 | --- |
| TRACTOR DIRT | 1,210 | 1,210 | --- |
| MATERIALS AND STRUCTURES ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 4,973 | 4,973 | --- |
| ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME (AIDS) RESEARCH | 22,558 | 44,558 | +22,000 |
| MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 8,821 | 8,821 | --- |
| DIRECTED ENERGY | 41,014 | 25,000 | -16,014 |
| TRACTOR CAGE | 16,241 | 16,241 | --- |
| ARMY DEVELOPMENT AND EMPLOYMENT AGENCY | --- | --- | --- |
| LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 11,773 | 11,773 | --- |
| JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM | 5,406 | 5,406 | --- |
| NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 20,296 | 20,296 | --- |
| MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 2,380 | 2,380 | --- |
| ADVANCED ELECTRONIC DEVICES DEVELOPMENT | 5,640 | 7,640 | +2,000 |
| CHEMICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE AND SMOKE ADV TECH | 4,071 | 4,071 | --- |
| ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY | 4,834 | 4,834 | --- |
| ADV SPECIAL OPERATIONS RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT AND ACQ | --- | --- | --- |
| ADVANCED FIELD ARTILLERY SYSTEM | --- | --- | --- |
| ARMOR GUN SYSTEM | --- | --- | --- |
| BATTERY TECHNOLOGY | --- | --- | --- |
| CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 7,629 | 7,629 | --- |
| TOTAL, ADVANCE TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 485,043 | 408,497 | -76,546 |
| STRATEGIC PROGRAMS |  |  |  |
| CHEMICAL WEAPONS TREATY MONITORING | --- | --- | --- |
| ANTI-SATELLITE WEAPON (ASAT) | 207,782 | 158,082 | -49,700 |
| CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 88,268 | 22,559 | -65,709 |
| TOTAL, STRATEGIC PROGRAMS | 296,050 | 180,641 | -115,409 |

[In thousands of dollars]

|  | Budget estimate | Committee recommendation | Senate compared with budget estimate |
|---|---|---|---|
| TACTICAL PROGRAMS |  |  |  |
| JOINT TACTICAL MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAM | 62,249 | 62,249 | --- |
| SURFACE-TO-SURFACE MISSILE ROCKET SYSTEM | 47,175 | 24,908 | -22,267 |
| NUCLEAR MUNITIONS - ADV DEV | 3,586 | 3,586 | --- |
| ADVANCED ANTI-TANK WEAPON SYSTEMS | 22,009 | 22,009 | --- |
| LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER - ADV DEV | 2,988 | 2,988 | --- |
| SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND EQUIP DEFEATING SYS - ADV DEV | 12,351 | 12,351 | --- |
| MEDIUM SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE | 6,898 | --- | -6,898 |
| IDENTIFICATION-FRIEND-OR-FOE - ADV DEV | 1,013 | 1,013 | --- |
| ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM | 21,701 | 14,701 | -7,000 |
| SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY | 7,532 | 7,532 | --- |
| FORWARD AREA AIR DEFENSE (FAAD) SYSTEM | --- | --- | --- |
| NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT | 3,272 | 3,272 | --- |
| LONGBOW | --- | --- | --- |
| AVIATION - ADV DEV | 5,134 | 5,134 | --- |
| WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - ADV DEV | 18,566 | 7,211 | -11,355 |
| CHEMICAL SYSTEMS - ADV DEV | 4,522 | 4,522 | --- |
| LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - ADV DEV | 13,449 | 13,449 | --- |
| COMBAT SERVICE SPT COMPUTER SYS EVAL AND ANALYSIS | 11,193 | 9,193 | -2,000 |
| CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT - ADV DEV | 24,511 | 34,511 | +10,000 |
| MEDICAL SYSTEMS - ADV DEV | 28,755 | 28,755 | --- |
| CLASSIFIED PROGRAM | 17,209 | 17,209 | --- |
| ADVANCED MISSILE SYSTEM-HEAVY | 1,013 | 1,013 | --- |
| AIRCRAFT WEAPONS | 7,607 | 5,607 | -2,000 |
| AIRCRAFT PROPULSION SYSTEM | 53,702 | 53,702 | --- |
| ARMY HELICOPTER IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM | 25,817 | --- | -25,817 |
| LIGHT ARMED SCOUT HELICOPTER | 411,357 | 261,357 | -150,000 |
| ARMY TACTICAL MISSILE SYSTEM (ARMY TACMS) | --- | --- | --- |
| MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES | 7,030 | 7,030 | --- |
| SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS - ENG DEV | 10,275 | 10,275 | --- |
| ADVANCED ANTI-TANK WEAPON SYSTEM - ENG DEV | 76,812 | 76,812 | --- |
| LANDMINE WARFARE | 34,684 | 34,684 | --- |
| HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES | --- | --- | --- |
| M1A1 DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM | 46,337 | --- | -46,337 |
| IDENTIFICATION-FRIEND-OR-FOE - ENG DEV | 13,859 | 13,859 | --- |
| NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS - ENG DEV | 17,726 | 17,726 | --- |
| COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT | 4,428 | 4,428 | --- |
| NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES - ENG DEV | 32,390 | 32,390 | --- |
| CCTT/SIMNET - RESERVE COMPONENTS | --- | 7,500 | +7,500 |
| SPECIAL PURPOSE DETECTORS | 507 | 507 | --- |
| AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELL - ENG DEV | 86,687 | 46,687 | -40,000 |
| AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT | 8,318 | 8,318 | --- |
| JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM | 45,833 | 35,633 | -10,200 |
| JT INTEROPERABILITY OF TACT C2 SYS (JINTACCS) | --- | --- | --- |
| AVIATION - ENG DEV | 19,376 | 19,376 | --- |
| WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - ENG DEV | 11,106 | 11,106 | --- |
| CHEMICAL SYSTEMS - ENG DEV | 27,806 | --- | -27,806 |
| LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - ENG DEV | 27,486 | 27,486 | --- |
| COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS - ENG DEV | 1,404 | 1,404 | --- |
| CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT - ENG DEV | 57,291 | 67,291 | +10,000 |
| MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT | 19,558 | 19,558 | --- |
| LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER - ENG DEV | 17,372 | 17,372 | --- |
| FIBER OPTIC GUIDED MISSILE - ENG DEV | 99,062 | 99,062 | --- |
| CLASSIFIED PROGRAM | 13,423 | 13,423 | --- |
| TRACTOR PULL | 35,149 | 45,149 | +10,000 |
| SENSE AND DESTROY ARMAMENT MISSILE - ENG DEV | 105,507 | 105,507 | --- |
| TRACTOR TRAILER | --- | 5,200 | +5,200 |
| LONGBOW - ENG DEV | 159,057 | --- | -159,057 |
| LONGBOW - CONSOLIDATED PROGRAM | --- | 171,514 | +171,514 |
| APACHE RELIABILITY ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM | --- | --- | --- |
| LH ALTERNATIVES | --- | --- | --- |
| TRACTOR CRASH/BALL | 2,495 | 2,495 | --- |
| ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYS (ATCCS) ENG DEV | 22,829 | 22,829 | --- |
| LOSAT | 72,872 | 30,872 | -42,000 |
| RADAR DEVELOPMENT | --- | --- | --- |
| FOLLOW-ON LANCE ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT | 112,228 | --- | -112,228 |
| JOINT CB POINT OF CONTACT, TEST AND ASSESSMENT | 6,328 | 6,328 | --- |
| ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM | 45,764 | 40,764 | -5,000 |
| COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS | 97,751 | 97,751 | --- |
| MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM | 25,541 | 25,541 | --- |
| 155MM SELF-PROPELLED HOWITZER IMPROVEMENTS | 8,809 | 8,809 | --- |

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget estimate | Committee recom-mendation | Senate compared with budget estimate |
|---|---|---|---|
| AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS | 60,457 | --- | -60,457 |
| AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM | 7,055 | 7,055 | --- |
| MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM | 40,817 | 40,817 | --- |
| OTHER MISSILE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS | 73,320 | 68,320 | -5,000 |
| TRACTOR RIG | 22,981 | 22,981 | --- |
| TRACTOR CARD | 7,378 | 7,378 | --- |
| TACIT RAINBOW | 105,258 | 102,700 | -2,558 |
| JOINT TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM (TRI-TAC) | 6,074 | 6,074 | --- |
| FORCE ENHANCEMENTS-ACTIVE | --- | --- | --- |
| TACJAM | --- | --- | --- |
| SOLDIER/MARINE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM | --- | 18,000 | +18,000 |
| CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 549,623 | 564,697 | +15,074 |
| TOTAL, TACTICAL PROGRAMS | 3,059,672 | 2,568,980 | -490,692 |
| INTELLIGENCE & COMMUNICATIONS | | | |
| TERRAIN INFORMATION - ENG DEV | 10,757 | 10,757 | --- |
| NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT) | 6,385 | 6,385 | --- |
| SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT | 47,744 | 42,744 | -5,000 |
| CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 30,513 | 30,513 | --- |
| ARMY MILSTAR TERMINALS | --- | -16,000 | -16,000 |
| TOTAL, INTELLIGENCE & COMMUNICATIONS | 95,399 | 74,399 | -21,000 |
| DEFENSEWIDE MISSION SUPPORT | | | |
| ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL | 180,033 | 180,033 | --- |
| ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES | 229,891 | 220,000 | -9,891 |
| ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS | 88,484 | 75,000 | -13,484 |
| ARMY USER TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND THREAT SIMULATORS | 41,224 | 41,224 | --- |
| TECHNOLOGY AND VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT | 35,976 | 35,976 | --- |
| METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO RDT&E ACTIVITIES | 24,395 | 23,138 | -1,257 |
| MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS | 23,435 | 23,435 | --- |
| EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS | 22,674 | 22,674 | --- |
| SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING | 63,278 | 63,278 | --- |
| PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES | 93,249 | 88,889 | -4,360 |
| INTERNATIONAL COOPERATIVE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT | 1,905 | 1,905 | --- |
| TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES | 7,658 | 5,858 | -1,800 |
| MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY | 12,786 | 12,786 | --- |
| RDT&E SUPPORT FOR NONDEVELOPMENTAL ITEMS | 7,576 | 7,576 | --- |
| PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENTS | 19,159 | 19,159 | --- |
| RPMA/BASE OPERATIONS - RDT&E | --- | 390,736 | +390,736 |
| REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE ACTIVITIES - RDT&E | 222,764 | --- | -222,764 |
| BASE OPERATIONS - RDT&E | 204,360 | --- | -204,360 |
| MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT) | 15,297 | 14,458 | -839 |
| INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS | 26,708 | --- | -26,708 |
| ARROYO CENTER | --- | 22,850 | +22,850 |
| RANGE SECURITY | --- | --- | --- |
| Classified Programs | --- | --- | --- |
| TOTAL, DEFENSEWIDE MISSION SUPPORT | 1,320,852 | 1,248,975 | -71,877 |
| R&D SUPPORT/CIVILIAN WORK YEAR GROWTH | --- | --- | --- |
| REDUCTION FOR ROBOTICS | --- | --- | --- |
| SEQUESTRATION REDUCTION | --- | --- | --- |
| UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION (Classified) | --- | --- | --- |
| TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL ARMY | 6,025,900 | 5,299,793 | -726,107 |

## RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, NAVY

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $9,739,174,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 9,102,400,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 8,459,853,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $8,459,853,000 for the Navy's research, development, test, and evaluation programs, a decrease of $642,547,000 to the budget request.

### SUMMARY TABLE

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget estimate | Committee recommendation | Change from budget |
|---|---|---|---|
| Technology base | 867,493 | 864,423 | −3,070 |
| Advanced technology development | 199,605 | 226,055 | +26,450 |
| Strategic programs | 285,720 | 263,290 | −22,430 |
| Tactical programs | 6,146,247 | 5,639,882 | −506,365 |
| Intelligence and communications | 873,640 | 867,549 | −6,091 |
| Defensewide mission support | 729,695 | 598,654 | −131,041 |

The budget activities and programs funded under this appropriation are discussed below.

### CLASSIFIED PROGRAM ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommends the following adjustments to classified programs, as explained in the classified annex to the Committee's report:

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget estimate | Committee recommendation | Compared with budget estimate |
|---|---|---|---|
| Link saki | 14,251 | | −14,251 |
| Chalk weed | 36,493 | 3,870 | -32,623 |
| Chalk poinsettia | | (−27,780) | (−27,780) |
| Ship subsystem dev/land-based test site | 37,538 | 32,578 | −5,000 |

### OTHER ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommends the following adjustments—already approved by the Senate—to the budget request:

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget estimate | Committee recommendation | Compared with budget estimate |
|---|---|---|---|
| Defense research sciences | 374,357 | 365,357 | −9,000 |
| Tactical oceanography technology | | 5,000 | +5,000 |
| Ocean/atmospheric support tech | 32,099 | 34,099 | +2,000 |
| Electronic warfare simulator development | 39,577 | 29,414 | −10,163 |
| Marine Corps ground combat/supporting arms systems | 43,725 | 55,725 | +12,000 |

## ADJUSTMENTS BASED ON POOR FINANCIAL EXECUTION IN FISCAL YEAR 1990

The Committee recommends the following adjustments to eliminate funds not expected to be spent in fiscal year 1991, due to slow execution and expenditure of fiscal year 1990 funds:

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget estimate | Committee recommendation | Compared with budget estimate |
|---|---|---|---|
| Tactical airborne reconnaissance | 30,950 | 28,950 | −2,000 |
| Command and control systems | 26,865 | 25,865 | −1,000 |
| IFF systems development | 11,772 | 8,772 | −3,000 |
| Tomahawk | 15,353 | 12,353 | −3,000 |
| Joint standoff weapon systems | 24,961 | 22,961 | −2,000 |
| F/A–18 squadrons | 79,215 | 76,715 | −2,500 |
| Fleet telecommunications—tactical | 8,985 | 7,985 | −1,000 |
| Satellite communications | 13,723 | 12,223 | −1,500 |
| Marine Corps assault vehicles—engineering dev (105 mm gun) | 22,934 | 18,934 | −4,000 |
| Marine Corps command/control communications systems | 13,822 | 11,822 | −2,000 |

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENTS

The fiscal year 1991 budget request included many programs which contain: (*a*) excessive growth; (*b*) lower priority efforts; (*c*) funds identified by the Navy or the General Accounting Office as excess to firm program requirements; and (*d*) funds associated with management support and RDT&E overhead functions. In expectation of the significant contraction of the defense research and development infrastructure due to likely budget constraints, the Committee recommends funding many of these program elements at the fiscal year 1990 level. Any funds identified as excess to firm program needs also are eliminated. The Committee recommends the following adjustments:

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget estimate | Committee recommendation | Compared with budget estimate |
|---|---|---|---|
| Management and technical support | 9,404 | 8,049 | −1,355 |
| $C^2$ surveillance/reconnaissance support | 9,983 | 9,450 | −533 |
| RDT&E lab and facilities management support | 59,655 | 51,847 | −7,808 |
| RDT&E ship and aircraft support | 85,257 | 73,305 | −11,952 |
| Test and evaluation support | 345,929 | 317,866 | −28,063 |
| International RDT&E | 4,042 | 3,037 | −1,005 |
| In-house lab independent R&D | 26,801 | 24,346 | −2,455 |
| Aircraft technology (Integrated High-Performance Turbine Engine Technology Program [IHPTET]—project) | 24,402 | 22,003 | −2,400 |
| Aircraft propulsion (IHPTET project) | 10,134 | 7,162 | −2,972 |
| Submarine sonar development (now terminated BQS–24 sonar system project) | 42,356 | 39,256 | −3,100 |
| Combat Information Center conversion (advanced combat direction system Navy tactical/data systems software improvements) | 29,961 | 25,163 | −4,798 |

*Antiair warfare/antisurface warfare technology (SEALAR—sea launch and recovery project).*—The Committee recommends $68,105,000, an increase of $5,000,000 to the budget request, for this technology base program element. The added funds are to be combined with the $2,500,000 already included in the budget request for the sea launch and recovery project. The Committee believes that the SEALAR project has the potential to develop a low cost-per-pound-to-orbit space booster, with increased operational availability, as a possible complement or alternative to current, costly Air Force space boosters. The recommended $7,500,000 fully funds the second year of a 3-year effort to demonstrate recovery and reusability of the SEALAR booster through suborbital tests, and to prove the technical basis for the economic projections for this approach. Full funding of this SEALAR project increment one, and its completion in fiscal year 1992, will assist Congress to evaluate whether to continue with the more expensive second and third increments in later years.

*Marine Corps landing force technology; Marine Corps advanced technology demonstration; airborne mine countermeasures—engineering development; USN/USMC mine warfare.*—The Committee recommends several actions in an attempt to eliminate duplication between Navy and Marine Corps projects to develop airborne countermine systems. The Marines have included $11,393,000 in their budget request as part of a $150,000,000 program to develop a jet aircraft airborne mine detection and surveillance system [AMDAS] by the year 2001. The Navy has been developing a helicopter-borne system, known as Magic Lantern, with funds added by Congress to the fiscal year 1990 budget. Impressive test results and limited operational experience already have been obtained with the system. Approximately $10,000,000 in additional funds would be needed in fiscal year 1991 to continue this development.

AMDAS and Magic Lantern use the same basic technologies for the same mission. Both systems, if fully developed, would have technical and operational strengths and weaknesses. The Committee does not believe that the Navy Department and the taxpayers can afford to develop two separate programs in a constrained budget environment. The Navy and the Marine Corps should select one of the two systems for continued development and deployment. Accordingly, the Committee denies the funds requested for AMDAS in the Marine Corps landing force technology ($1,215,000) and advanced technology demonstration ($10,178,000) program elements. It also does not recommend additional funds for Magic Lantern in the Navy's airborne mine countermeasures—engineering development program element. Instead, the Committee creates a new USN/USMC mine warfare program element and recommends $15,697,000 for a joint effort in fiscal year 1991 for whichever of the two systems is selected as better able to meet most of the operational and technical requirements of both services.

The Committee directs that none of these funds may be obligated or expended until the Navy and Marine Corps rigorously compare both systems and wait 30 days after they jointly report their choice to Congress. The Committee expects that the comparison will be based on actual hardware demonstrations to the maximum extent possible, and will include, at a minimum, assessments of the operational utility, cost, schedule, technical risk, affordability, and near-term adaptability to multimission use of both systems. The Committee expects that the report to Congress will contain detailed information on each of these considerations. Of the funds provided, the Committee directs that $10,697,000 be used to continue development of the selected system, and that $5,000,000 be used for purposes explained in the classified annex to this report.

*Electric drive.*—The Committee recommends $53,799,000, an increase of $10,000,000 to the budget request to this program to develop more efficient and less complex propulsion and power systems for surface ships and submarines. The increase is recommended to enable the Navy to reduce the technical risks associated with developing the electric drive technologies.

*Medical development (advanced).*—The Committee recommends $22,966,000, an increase of $6,000,000 to the budget request, for this program element to develop technologies to improve the health care and combat casualty treatment for Navy and Marine Corps personnel. The recommended increase is to support the Navy Medical Research and Development Command and the National Institutes of Health for human leukocyte antigen [HLA] tissue typing of thousands of volunteers now on the waiting lists to be included in the National Bone Marrow Donor Registry.

The Committee intends that these funds be used primarily to increase significantly the number of potential bone marrow donors. The Committee expects that any Defense Department activities financed with these funds will be coordinated fully with the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute.

The conferees direct the Navy and the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, in consultation with the Board of Directors of the National Marrow Donor Program [NMDP], to submit, no later than March 15, 1991, a detailed report outlining the specific activities to be supported by the total funding provided. This report should include, at a minimum, information about (1) the number of volunteers to be tested with these funds; (2) the projected ethnic and racial distribution of these volunteers; (3) the status of ongoing efforts to enhance cooperation between the National Marrow Donor Program and private donor registries; (4) a plan to broaden ethnic and racial representation in the National Marrow Donor Program; (5) how the National Marrow Donor Program will allocate funds to entities such as donor centers, family bone marrow donation drives, and community grassroots organizations in need of funding for the typing of potential donors; and (6) a detailed description of all bone marrow-related activities by the Department of Defense, in addition to recruitment and typing, that are being financed with these funds, and any other funds provided for bone marrow-related efforts during fiscal years 1990–91.

*Generic logistics R&D technology demonstration.*—The Committee recommends $27,640,000, an increase of $13,600,000 to the budget request for this program element. The increase is intended to continue and enhance the Navy's project for the rapid acquisition of manufactured parts [RAMP]. RAMP is a computer-aided design and manufacturing process to produce small quantities of unique parts for military systems.

*Advanced technology transition.*—The Committee recommends $61,143,000 for this program element. This amount is $10,000,000 above the budget request. The increase is provided to permit the Navy to continue leasing the *Amy Chouest* and *Cory Chouest* oceanographic ships, which are engaged in high-priority antisubmarine warfare research. The Committee has received information from the Navy demonstrating the cost effectiveness of continued leasing of the *Amy Chouest* compared with other alternatives. The Navy also has stated that both vessels are unique assets to the Critical Sea Tests Program to reduce the development risk of low-frequency active ASW systems. In view of these testimonials, the Committee directs that the Navy include sufficient funds in the fiscal year 1992 budget request to continue operating these vessels. A Navy failure to budget adequately for these ships could encourage legislative direction to the service to absorb these costs from within existing resources in fiscal year 1992.

*Trident II.*—This program supports development and improvement of the Navy's newest submarine-launched ballistic missile [SLBM], designated the Trident II, or D–5, missile. The Committee recommends $70,757,000, a reduction of $21,065,000 to the budget request. The recommendation denies funds not projected last year for fiscal year 1991 for the SLBM effectiveness enhancement [SEE] effort. The Trident II missile already possesses the accuracy and payload combination to meet mission requirements across the entire target spectrum. The Navy has failed to justify the need for the large funding increase to enhance the missile's effectiveness, especially since the D–5 just achieved operational status in March 1990, and only limited operational experience has been recorded.

*Fleet ballistic missile system.*—This program develops technologies to assure the continued effectiveness of deployed Navy strategic ballistic missiles. The Committee recommends $23,129,000, a reduction of $9,800,000 to the budget request. The recommendation fully funds requested activities to maintain the Poseidon and Trident I missiles which will continue to be operational for the next 8 to 12 years. However, it denies funds requested for the vulnerability and effectiveness efforts associated with the just-deployed Trident II (D–5) missile. Such efforts are premature, since significant operational experience has yet to be obtained with the D–5 to determine firm requirements for any improvements to the missile.

*Advanced tactical support [ATS].*—This program is a new start to develop a single aircraft to replace several special-purpose, carrier-based, naval fixed-wing aircraft. The recommendation denies the requested $1,510,000. The future of the Navy's carrier force structure, and the number and composition of the needed air wings, remain too unsettled now to begin another, ultimately expensive, replacement aircraft program. The Committee understands that the Navy aviation community is reassessing the requirements and content of the current ATS program. The ATS should compete for funds with other Navy priorities in the fiscally constrained fiscal years 1992–97 spending plan.

*NATO AAW system.*—The Committee recommends $18,210,000 for this program to develop improved antiair warfare/air defense capabilities for certain classes of Navy ships. The recommendation is $6,534,000 below the budget request. The reduction defers by 1 to

2 months (from August/September 1991, to fiscal year 1992) the award of a prime contract for full-scale engineering development of this $1,600,000,000 program, which suffers from uncertain platform requirements, an undefinitized cost-sharing schedule with allied participants, and questions about its adequacy against the severest threats. The program also has been restructured completely since submission of the budget request. The brief deferral recommended by the Committee affords Congress the chance to review the program's viability, cost effectiveness, and affordability under the constrained conditions of the new budget environment next year. The recommended funding for fiscal year 1991 is essentially the same as the fiscal year 1990 level for the program.

*SSBN security technology program; nonacoustic antisubmarine warfare [ASW].*—The Committee recommends two modifications to Navy program elements associated with nonacoustic ASW. An addition of $8,435,000 is recommended only for nonacoustic ASW efforts in the SSBN security technology program, which would increase the program element to $51,566,000. The Committee also recommends a total of $14,000,000, a reduction of $8,884,000 from the budget request for the separate, Navy program in generic nonacoustic ASW technologies. The reduction is recommended to transfer these funds to the "Defense agencies RDT&E" account to support a joint nonacoustic ASW program under the Office of the Secretary of Defense [OSD]. The OSD joint program, for which $30,000,000 is recommended in the "Defense agencies" account, includes the Navy, other Federal organizations, and the national weapons laboratories of the Department of Energy.

The decrease in the separate Navy program also is recommended to reduce the rate of growth from the fiscal year 1990 level, when Congress denied all funds for the program and transferred them to OSD to create the joint activity. The Committee believes that both the joint program and the separate Navy effort now have the potential to make a meaningful contribution toward developing nonacoustic ASW technologies. To maximize this potential, the Committee also directs that none of the funds added to the two Navy program elements may be obligated or expended until the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition) and the Secretary of the Navy certify jointly that the proposed, separate Navy efforts complement, not duplicate, joint program endeavors. A similar restriction is imposed on the joint program funds. Direction regarding funds for classified project 111 is contained in the entry for the joint program in the "Defense agencies" account.

*Ship development.*—The Committee recommends $4,729,000, a reduction of $14,135,000 from the budget for this program to study and design new classes of ships for the future Navy. The recommendation holds this lower priority program element to the fiscal year 1990 level ($5,489,000), denies $4,162,000 requested for a premature start to design a new class of submarine tender, and adds $3,402,000 for a congressional initiative to develop fast sealift technologies. Instead of beginning a costly new program for a new submarine tender, the Committee believes the Navy should consider modifying its current tenders to support the SSN-21 as well as current submarines.

The Committee intends for the funds added for fast sealift technologies to be combined with $11,598,000 in fiscal year 1990 funds appropriated for the same purpose. As a part of its sealift enhancement initiative last year, the Committee provided $15,000,000 to fully fund the first year of a 24-month program to develop new fast sealift technologies. The Defense Department tried to rescind, defer, or reallocate these funds, and most of them remain unspent. Events in the Persian Gulf demonstrate the prudence of beginning this research and development initiative without further delay. The Committee's recommendation, when added to the remaining prior-year funds, will fully support the first year of the fast sealift technologies effort. The Committee directs that the moneys are to be used as mandated in its report on the Fiscal Year 1990 Defense Appropriations Act.

To encourage the Defense Department and the Navy to follow the dictates of Congress in this high-priority national security matter, the Committee also recommends bill language requiring the obligation of the full $15,000,000 in fast sealift enhancement funds within 90 days after enactment of the fiscal year 1991 appropriations measure.

*Advanced nuclear power systems.*—This program develops advanced components for Navy nuclear reactors. The Committee recommends $80,093,000, which represents a reduction of $30,000,000 to the budget request but 13 percent real growth above the fiscal year 1990 appropriated level. The amount denied is from the nuclear technology development project to develop components for an application far in the future. These funds are premature, since the Navy has yet to complete development of its newest reactor. The recommendation still provides 59 percent real growth in this particular project.

*Marine Corps assault vehicles—advanced.*—The Committee recommends $26,417,000, a reduction of $16,174,000 to the budget request for this program to maintain and improve the capabilities of amphibious assault vehicles. The recommendation extends the preadvanced development phase of the Marine Corps' expensive program for a new or improved vehicle to meet future, seaborne amphibious assault needs. The recommendation would defer, by 3 months, beginning the more costly demonstration/validation phase of this program. The deferral gives OSD and Congress more time to assess the viability and affordability of the project within the constrained fiscal years 1992–97 defense spending plan, and to examine results of the Corps' study of the 13 alternatives for meeting its needs in this area. These alternatives include forgoing an expensive new vehicle and upgrading current vehicles, or using landing craft air cushion [LCAC] platforms.

*Tactical nuclear development; unguided conventional air-launched weapons.*—The Navy has been developing a new nuclear bomb, known as the B–90 nuclear depth/strike bomb, to maintain and improve its capabilities to wage tactical nuclear warfare. The Committee denies funds associated with development of this new weapon, and its training bomb dummy unit, due to concerns about its operational viability and affordability. The recommendation also denies funds for Marine Corps participation in a previously terminated program, the W–82 nuclear artillery shell, and for the air standoff (nuclear) weapon advanced technology effort. The latter effort is premature and possibly duplicates the Air Force's new nuclear short-range attack missile—tactical.

The Committee understands that the urgency of deploying a new nuclear depth/strike bomb has decreased since the Navy already is scheduled to receive new, modernized versions of the B-61 tactical strike bomb. Total cost of the B-90 just to the Department of Energy could well exceed $1,000,000,000. Additional funds will be required by the Navy to continue acquiring the weapon. The Committee questions the utility of such a large investment.

To implement its recommendations, the Committee approves $8,685,000 for the tactical nuclear development program element. This is a reduction of $5,800,000 from the budget request. The Committee approves $3,678,000 for the unguided conventional air-launched weapons program element. This action decreases the budget request by the $4,057,000 sought for the B-90 training bomb dummy unit.

*V-22A; V-22A prior-year funds; helicopter development.*—The Committee has taken two actions regarding the modernization of the Marine Corps' medium-lift, amphibious assault aviation capabilities. First, the Committee recommends continuing development of the V-22A tilt-rotor aircraft and provides $38,000,000 in new spending authority added to the budget request, and $200,000,000 in prior-year V-22A advance procurement funds. The Committee recommends bill language to permit use of these prior-year funds for research and development.

The conference report accompanying the fiscal year 1990 Defense Appropriations Act noted that the Secretary of Defense had directed the Institute of Defense Analysis [IDA] to conduct a cost and operational effectiveness analysis [COEA] on the V-22 and other possible helicopter alternatives. The conferees further stated "that this study should be used as a basis for a decision to begin production of the V-22 in fiscal year 1991."

The results of this COEA, which were provided to the Congress in draft form, found the V-22 Osprey to be more cost-effective in performing several missions, including Marine amphibious assault, Naval search and rescue, special operations forces activities and drug interdiction, than all of the seven helicopter alternatives evaluated in the study.

In consideration of the results of this study and the military potential for an aircraft with the V-22's capabilities, it is the opinion of the Committee that the V-22 research and development program should continue in fiscal year 1991.

Accordingly, the Committee provides $238,000,000 for continued research, development, and testing of the V-22. The Committee notes that the Comptroller General of the United States reported on March 6, 1990, that the decision by the Department of Defense on December 1, 1989, to impound the fiscal year 1989 advance procurement funds for the V-22 was unauthorized. The Committee further notes that the decision of the Department of Defense to impound the fiscal year 1989 funds has had an adverse impact on the program's production schedule and overall cost. Therefore, the Committee has directed the Defense Department to reexamine its plans for V-22.

Second, the Committee recommends $14,645,000, a reduction of $51,000,000 to the budget request, to the helicopter development program element. This action denies funds to begin an expensive program for a new medium-lift helicopter. This new aircraft is unneeded at present with continuation of V-22A research and development.

*P-3 modernization program.*—This program element funds improvements to the Navy's current fleet of P-3 land-based, maritime patrol aircraft for antisubmarine warfare. It also includes funds to develop the successor platform to the P-3, known as the P-7 long-range air antisubmarine warfare-capable aircraft. Since submission of the budget request, the Navy has terminated the P-7 program due to cost problems. The service is undecided on the cost, schedule, content, and affordability of any replacement for the P-7. Accordingly, the Committee recommends $65,832,000 for this program element, a reduction of $214,892,000 from the budget request for the P-7. The Committee recommends transferring $20,000,000 of the original P-7 budget request to support the P-3 update IV avionics upgrade project. Although contained in the P-7 project because the P-7 was to carry this equipment suite, these funds were allocated for update IV avionics development.

*Acoustic search sensors.*—The Committee recommends $23,969,000, a reduction of $11,720,000 to the budget request for this program to improve acoustic antisubmarine warfare sensors. The recommendation defers beginning of full-scale development for the new air deployable active receiver [ADAR]. The Navy has been unable to demonstrate the difference between this project and the failed horizontal line array project, which the service claims is ADAR's former designation. The recommended deferral will permit Congress to evaluate the new project's technological readiness to enter full-scale development, and its affordability under future budget limits.

*Aircraft engine component improvement program.*—The Committee recommends $37,277,000 for this program element to enhance the capabilities of already fielded aircraft engines. The recommendation is $4,607,000 below the budget request. The Committee's action denies new start projects but fully funds ongoing efforts and projects associated with maintaining safety of flight. The same recommendation will be made for the same program in the Air Force.

*Electronic warfare [EW] development.*—This program funds many projects to develop or improve electronic combat systems for Navy ships and Navy/Marine Corps aircraft. The Committee recommends $146,514,000, a reduction of $175,000 to the budget request. The recommendation adds $6,500,000 to accelerate operational testing of the airborne self-protection jammer [ASPJ] to determine whether previous performance problems have been resolved. Funds are denied for two projects as follows: (*a*) −$6,400,000 for the ASPJ preplanned product improvement [P$^3$I] effort; and (*b*) −$275,000 in the tactical airborne EW project for optical countermeasures work.

The Committee believes that the ASPJ P$^3$I project is premature, considering the problems mentioned previously with the baseline ASPJ system. The optical countermeasures recommendation parallels actions the committee is recommending for the Army and Air Force in this area. The Navy is directed to cooperate with the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency [DARPA] to adapt DARPA's optical countermeasures project to meet its needs.

The Committee also notes that the request for the EW development program element includes $15,716,000 to begin development of the Integrated Defensive Avionics Program [IDAP]. IDAP is a complex integration development effort intended for an aircraft modification program previously terminated by the Navy and Congress. The terminated program was deemed unaffordable, low priority, and not likely to contribute sufficiently to the survivability of the aircraft to warrant its cost. The Navy has not provided sufficient information to resolve the technological, cost, performance, and priority issues raised by the current IDAP proposal.

The Navy also has failed to demonstrate the need for, and utility of, integrating the IDAP system onto additional aircraft types beyond the single platform currently proposed. If the Navy concludes this need and utility exists, the Committee directs that the service include full funding for this integration in its fiscal years 1992–97 program.

*Aegis combat system engineering.*—The Committee recommends $46,930,000 for this program element to develop upgrades to the combat systems for the CG–47 cruisers and the DDG–51 destroyers. The recommended amount is $44,889,000 below the budget request. The Committee denies funds in each of the three projects in this program element.

The $39,810,000 in project 1937 (DDG weapons development) to begin development of DDG–51 flight III ships is deferred as unneeded and premature until the fiscal year 1992 budget request. This action is based on decisions by Secretary Cheney in the major warship review and by the Navy. It has been decided to construct the first DDG–51 flight III ships in fiscal year 1995, instead of fiscal year 1994, which was the basis of the budget request.

The Navy requested $4,500,000 in project 1337 (DDG combat systems engineering) to study ships to succeed the DDG–51 class after the year 2000. These funds are premature in view of uncertainties about the size and composition of the future Navy due to budget constraints and the rapidly changing threat environment. According to Navy documents, $579,000 requested in project 1447 (CG combat system engineering) actually will be obligated in fiscal year 1992. Therefore, these funds are unneeded in fiscal year 1991.

*Sea Lance; vertical-launch ASROC (antisubmarine rocket).*—The budget request proposed terminating development of the Sea Lance standoff antisubmarine weapon to be deployed aboard both surface ships and submarines. As a less capable alternative to Sea Lance, the Defense Department requested funds to integrate the new Mark–50 lightweight torpedo into existing vertical-launch ASROC launchers on surface ships. The Committee disagrees with these proposals and recommends adding $71,000,000 to the budget request to continue development of Sea Lance. The $30,000,000 requested for the vertical-launch ASROC alternative is denied as duplicative and unnecessary with restoration of the Sea Lance program.

*Air-to-air missile systems engineering.*—As already approved by the full Senate, the Committee recommends that $26,487,000 requested by the Navy for a separate upgrade program for the AIM–

9 Sidewinder missile be transferred to OSD to support a consolidated program with the Air Force. A similar recommendation in the "Air Force RDT&E" account deletes $25,000,000 sought by that service for a separate Sidewinder improvement effort. The recommendation here deletes the abovementioned funds from the Navy budget request.

*Naval gunnery improvements.*—The Committee approves the full budget request of $16,765,000 for this program element. Of the funds provided, the Committee directs that $10,142,000 is available only for the 16-inch gun improvement project. This latter amount is the same amount as that included in the budget request for this project.

*Marine Corps mine/countermeasures systems—engineering development.*—The Committee recommends $7,078,000 for this program element, a reduction of $23,947,000 from the budget request. The recommendation terminates the surf zone mine-clearing system [CATFAE] program based on concerns about cost and effectiveness, and on the availability of alternative mine-clearing systems. The recommendation will save approximately $100,000,000 in the next several years.

The Marine Corps proposed to spend an additional $59,300,000 for research and development and $62,800,000 to procure only 55 CATFAE systems—for a unit cost of $2,200,000 per system. Additionally, the CATFAE fuel air explosive system will cost 400 percent more than the current mine line clearing charge system for comparable coverage, and it will not defeat many types of mines. In the early 1980's, the Army completed research and development on an almost identical program, designated SLUFAE. That service concluded that fuel air explosives for minefield clearing should not be pursued based on high cost and marginal effectiveness against nonpressure plate and hardened mines. The Committee recommendation assumes that the currently procured, less expensive mine line clearing charge system is sufficient to defeat pressure-sensitive mines.

*Surface ASW system improvement.*—The Committee recommends $99,995,000, a reduction of $22,614,000 to the budget request, for this activity to enhance the antisubmarine warfare capabilities of existing and future surface combatants. The recommendation deletes these funds because an equal amount of fiscal year 1990 funds has been identified as excess to fiscal year 1990 needs and can be made available to fund fiscal year 1991 requirements. The fiscal year 1990 funds are $8,514,000 associated with a 4-month delay in a contract award, and $14,100,000 which the General Accounting Office [GAO] reported the Navy had identified as excess to program requirements.

*Milstar satellite communications system.*—The Committee denies the budget request of $4,591,000 for the joint program office for the Milstar system. The full Senate already has endorsed termination of the program.

*Center for Naval Analyses [CNA].*—As part of its initiative to eliminate exorbitant growth in funding for defense federally funded research and development centers [FFRDC's], the Committee recommends $20,876,000 for the Center for Naval Analyses. The recommendation represents a reduction to the budget request of

$5,320,000, and is CNA's share of an action to reduce total defense FFRDC funding to the fiscal year 1987 level, as adjusted for inflation. Fiscal year 1987 was the peak year of defense RDT&E funding during the last decade. Full justification and direction for implementing this recommendation are contained in the introduction to the RDT&E section of the report. Although for accounting purposes, the recommendation is assessed against this RDT&E program element, the Committee intends that the reduction be applied against total fiscal year 1991 funding for CNA, which includes the above direct appropriation plus additional Defense Department contract funds. This total fiscal year 1991 request for CNA is $43,890,000.

*Industrial preparedness.*—As already approved by the full Senate, the Committee recommends transferring $38,827,000 requested by the Navy for manufacturing technology development to a new, consolidated program element under the auspices of OSD. Similar recommendations are made for the Army, Air Force, and Defense Logistics Agency manufacturing technology program elements. Further direction regarding items of Committee special interest in this joint program is contained in the "Defense Agencies RDT&E" section of the report. The Committee recommendation retains $3,000,000 in this Navy program element, as already approved by the Senate.

*Test ranges base operations/real property maintenance; Navy laboratories overhead.*—In anticipation of a major contraction in the defense RDT&E infrastructure due to overall budget limits, the Committee recommends a reduction of $24,300,000 in the funds allocated for base operations and real property maintenance at Navy test ranges. A reduction of $19,300,000 also is recommended in the funds allocated for Navy laboratories. These recommendations are consistent with the Committee's actions to reduce Army and Air Force RDT&E infrastructure.

The test ranges recommendation is intended to reduce the growth requested in the fiscal year 1991 budget for these facilities. The laboratories action is intended to reduce growth for an ambitious facilities improvement program that is premature because of possible laboratory consolidation or reorganization. The unique financing mechanism for Navy test ranges and laboratories—through a central industrial fund—also requires that Congress be informed about the specific actions the Navy will take to implement these Committee recommendations. The Committee directs that the Navy report to Congress with the fiscal year 1992 budget request these actions and the associated dollar amounts and locations.

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget estimate | Committee recommendation | Senate compared with budget estimate |
|---|---|---|---|
| RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL NAVY | | | |
| TECHNOLOGY BASE | | | |
| IN-HOUSE INDEPENDENT LABORATORY RESEARCH.............. | 26,801 | 24,346 | -2,455 |
| DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES.............................. | 374,357 | 365,357 | -9,000 |
| ANTI-AIR WARFARE/ANTI-SURFACE WARFARE TECHNOLOGY...... | 63,105 | 68,105 | +5,000 |
| SURFACE SHIP TECHNOLOGY............................... | 15,982 | 15,982 | --- |
| AIRCRAFT TECHNOLOGY.................................... | 24,403 | 22,003 | -2,400 |
| MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY................. | 18,132 | 16,917 | -1,215 |
| COMMAND, CONTROL, AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY....... | 18,393 | 18,393 | --- |
| MISSION SUPPORT TECHNOLOGY............................ | 34,493 | 34,493 | --- |
| MATERIALS.............................................. | --- | --- | --- |
| SYSTEMS SUPPORT TECHNOLOGY............................ | 69,152 | 69,152 | --- |
| EW TECHNOLOGY.......................................... | 12,872 | 12,872 | --- |
| ASW TECHNOLOGY......................................... | 114,677 | 114,677 | --- |
| TACTICAL OCEANOGRAPHY TECHNOLOGY...................... | --- | 5,000 | +5,000 |
| MINE AND SPECIAL WARFARE TECHNOLOGY................... | 17,926 | 17,926 | --- |
| SUBMARINE TECHNOLOGY.................................. | 16,701 | 16,701 | --- |
| NUCLEAR PROPULSION.................................... | 14,575 | 14,575 | --- |
| OCEAN AND ATMOSPHERIC SUPPORT TECHNOLOGY.............. | 32,099 | 34,099 | +2,000 |
| INDEPENDENT EXPLORATORY DEVELOPMENT................... | 13,825 | 13,825 | --- |
| TOTAL, TECHNOLOGY BASE............................... | 867,493 | 864,423 | -3,070 |
| ADVANCE TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | | | |
| AIRCRAFT PROPULSION................................... | 10,134 | 7,162 | -2,972 |
| ADVANCED AIRCRAFT SUBSYSTEMS.......................... | 5,966 | 5,966 | --- |
| EW TECHNOLOGY.......................................... | --- | --- | --- |
| ELECTROMAGNETIC RADIATION SOURCE ELIMINATION TECH..... | 5,734 | 5,734 | --- |
| ELECTRIC DRIVE......................................... | 43,799 | 53,799 | +10,000 |
| UNMANNED UNDERSEA VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY.................. | --- | --- | --- |
| MARINE CORPS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION........ | 15,254 | 5,076 | -10,178 |
| HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING.............................. | 2,883 | 2,883 | --- |
| MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT.................................... | 16,966 | 22,966 | +6,000 |
| MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL SYSTEMS......................... | 3,200 | 3,200 | --- |
| GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS....... | 14,040 | 27,640 | +13,600 |
| EDUCATION AND TRAINING................................. | 5,983 | 5,983 | --- |
| MARINE CORPS ADVANCED MANPOWER/TRAINING SYSTEMS....... | 3,110 | 3,110 | --- |
| SIMULATION AND TRAINING DEVICES........................ | 5,042 | 5,042 | --- |
| ADVANCED ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE TECHNOLOGY............ | 16,351 | 16,351 | --- |
| ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION........................ | 51,143 | 61,143 | +10,000 |
| PLUME CHARACTERIZATION................................ | --- | --- | --- |
| ADV SPECIAL OPERATIONS RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT AND ACQ.. | --- | --- | --- |
| TOTAL, ADVANCE TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT............... | 199,605 | 226,055 | +26,450 |
| STRATEGIC PROGRAMS | | | |
| TACTICAL SPACE OPERATIONS............................. | 3,591 | 3,591 | --- |
| SSBN SURVIVABILITY.................................... | 15,649 | 15,649 | --- |
| WWMCCS ARCHITECTURE SUPPORT........................... | --- | --- | --- |
| TRIDENT II............................................. | 91,822 | 70,757 | -21,065 |
| STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT........................... | 6,287 | 6,287 | --- |
| FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE SYSTEM........................ | 32,929 | 23,129 | -9,800 |
| SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM...................... | 43,131 | 51,566 | +8,435 |
| SUB ACOUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT...................... | 31,271 | 31,271 | --- |
| TRIDENT................................................ | 37,400 | 37,400 | --- |
| EXTREMELY LOW FREQUENCY (ELF) COMMUNICATIONS.......... | 103 | 103 | --- |
| NAVY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS......................... | 17,116 | 17,116 | --- |
| SEALAR................................................. | --- | --- | --- |
| SUBMARINE LASER COMMUNICATIONS........................ | --- | --- | --- |
| NAVAL SPACE SURVEILLANCE.............................. | 866 | 866 | --- |
| MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK.... | 1,559 | 1,559 | --- |
| WORLD-WIDE MILITARY COMMAND & CONTROL SYS, INFO SYS... | 3,996 | 3,996 | --- |
| TOTAL, STRATEGIC PROGRAMS........................... | 285,720 | 263,290 | -22,430 |

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget estimate | Committee recom- mendation | Senate compared with budget estimate |
|---|---|---|---|
| TACTICAL PROGRAMS | | | |
| INTEGRATED AIRCRAFT AVIONICS | 4,992 | 4,992 | --- |
| AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS | 7,296 | 7,296 | --- |
| T-45 TRAINING SYSTEM | 14,916 | 14,916 | --- |
| AIR CREW SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY | 9,816 | 9,816 | --- |
| ADVANCED TACTICAL SUPPORT (ATS) | 1,510 | --- | -1,510 |
| SKIPPER ENHANCEMENTS | --- | --- | --- |
| CV ASW MODULE | 3,625 | 3,625 | --- |
| NAVY ADVANCED TACTICAL FIGHTER | 65,685 | 65,685 | --- |
| AIR ASW | 11,319 | 11,319 | --- |
| AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES | 16,930 | 16,930 | --- |
| TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE | 30,950 | 28,950 | -2,000 |
| AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY AND VULNERABILITY | 9,385 | 9,385 | --- |
| ADVANCED SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE | 43,755 | 43,755 | --- |
| NATO AAW SYSTEMS | 24,744 | 18,210 | -6,534 |
| LOW COST ANTI-RADIATION SEEKER | 10,357 | 10,357 | --- |
| ADVANCED AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AAAM) | 84,225 | 84,225 | --- |
| BATTLE GROUP AAW COORDINATION | 3,949 | 3,949 | --- |
| SURFACE MINE COUNTERMEASURES | 21,003 | 21,003 | --- |
| ADVANCED SUBMARINE ASW DEVELOPMENT | 29,140 | 29,140 | --- |
| SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE | 53,919 | 53,919 | --- |
| SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS | 8,118 | 8,118 | --- |
| SHIPBOARD SYSTEM COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT | --- | --- | --- |
| SHIP COMBAT SURVIVABILITY | 32,087 | 32,087 | --- |
| SUBMARINE ARCTIC WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROGRAM | 2,892 | 2,892 | --- |
| PILOT FISH | 55,853 | 55,853 | --- |
| NON-ACOUSTIC ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE (ASW) | 22,884 | 14,000 | -8,884 |
| ADVANCED ASW TARGET | 5,020 | 5,020 | --- |
| RETRACT JUNIPER | 41,384 | 41,384 | --- |
| RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL | 4,062 | 4,062 | --- |
| LINK SAKI | 14,251 | --- | -14,251 |
| SURFACE ASW | 45,801 | 45,801 | --- |
| ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT | 52,137 | 52,137 | --- |
| SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS | 7,417 | 7,417 | --- |
| SHIP DEVELOPMENT | 18,864 | 4,729 | -14,135 |
| ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS | 110,093 | 80,093 | -30,000 |
| CHALK EAGLE | 112,322 | 112,322 | --- |
| COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION | 10,173 | 10,173 | --- |
| JOINT ADVANCED SYSTEMS | 201,228 | 201,228 | --- |
| MINE DEVELOPMENT | 5,042 | 5,042 | --- |
| CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS | 53,321 | 53,321 | --- |
| ADVANCED WARHEAD DEVELOPMENT | 5,163 | 5,163 | --- |
| MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES | 42,591 | 26,417 | -16,174 |
| MARINE CORPS MINE/COUNTERMEASURES SYSTEMS - ADV DEV | 5,788 | 5,788 | --- |
| TACTICAL NUCLEAR DEVELOPMENT | 14,485 | 8,685 | -5,800 |
| MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM | 11,153 | 11,153 | --- |
| JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT | 9,145 | 9,145 | --- |
| MK 48 ADCAP - ADV DEV | 60,264 | 60,264 | --- |
| OCEAN ENGINEERING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 2,278 | 2,278 | --- |
| ASW OCEANOGRAPHY | 9,794 | 9,794 | --- |
| ASW SIGNAL PROCESSING | 28,642 | 28,642 | --- |
| ADVANCED MARINE BIOLOGICAL SYSTEM | 5,737 | 5,737 | --- |
| FLEET TACTICAL DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION PROGRAM | 6,621 | 6,621 | --- |
| OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENTS | 15,438 | 15,438 | --- |
| COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS | 26,865 | 25,865 | -1,000 |
| NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM | 7,541 | 7,541 | --- |
| FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT | 1,022 | 1,022 | --- |
| MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT | 1,332 | 1,332 | --- |
| CHALK CORAL | 31,129 | 31,129 | --- |
| LINK HAZEL | 1,127 | 1,127 | --- |
| LINK LAUREL | 105,713 | 105,713 | --- |
| RETRACT MAPLE | 165,505 | 165,505 | --- |
| LINK PLUMERIA | 12,924 | 12,924 | --- |
| CHALK WEED | 36,493 | 3,870 | -32,623 |
| RETRACT ELM | 105,085 | 105,085 | --- |
| CHALK POINSETTIA | --- | -27,780 | -27,780 |
| WARFARE SYSTEMS ARCHITECTURE AND ENGINEERING | 6,891 | 6,891 | --- |
| ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE ENVIRONMENTAL ACOUSTIC SUPPORT | 17,428 | 17,428 | --- |
| SPECIAL PROCESSES | 31,819 | 31,819 | --- |
| STANDARD AVIONICS DEVELOPMENT | 7,589 | 7,589 | --- |
| IFF SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT | 11,772 | 8,772 | -3,000 |
| LAMPS | 21,627 | 21,627 | --- |

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget estimate | Committee recom-mendation | Senate compared with budget estimate |
|---|---|---|---|
| HELICOPTER DEVELOPMENT | 65,645 | 14,645 | -51,000 |
| AV-8B AIRCRAFT - ENG DEV | 30,704 | 30,704 | --- |
| SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 22,843 | 22,843 | --- |
| AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING | 2,852 | 2,852 | --- |
| AIRBORNE ASW DEVELOPMENTS | 12,708 | 12,708 | --- |
| P-3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM | 280,724 | 65,832 | -214,892 |
| C/MH-53E | 19,928 | 19,928 | --- |
| ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS | 35,689 | 23,969 | -11,720 |
| V-22A | --- | 38,000 | +38,000 |
| V-22A (PRIOR YEAR TRANSFER) | --- | (200,000) | (+200,000) |
| AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 20,891 | 20,891 | --- |
| AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM | 41,884 | 37,277 | -4,607 |
| EW DEVELOPMENT | 146,689 | 146,514 | -175 |
| MK 92 FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM UPGRADE | 3,365 | 3,365 | --- |
| AEGIS AREA AIR DEFENSE | 7,659 | 7,659 | --- |
| AEGIS COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING | 91,819 | 46,930 | -44,889 |
| SEA LANCE | --- | 71,000 | +71,000 |
| ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE | 3,685 | 3,685 | --- |
| AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEMS ENGINEERING | 26,487 | --- | -26,487 |
| VERTICAL LAUNCH ASROC | 30,000 | --- | -30,000 |
| CLOSE-IN WEAPON SYSTEM (PHALANX) | 6,443 | 6,443 | --- |
| NATO SEA SPARROW | 6,007 | 6,007 | --- |
| STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS | 44,734 | 44,734 | --- |
| TOMAHAWK | 15,353 | 12,353 | -3,000 |
| 5"ROLLING AIR FRAME MISSILE | 2,950 | 2,950 | --- |
| SSN-688 CLASS VERTICAL LAUNCH SYSTEM | 12,639 | 12,639 | --- |
| NEW THREAT UPGRADE | 12,443 | 12,443 | --- |
| AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES - ENG DEV | --- | --- | --- |
| SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS | 11,417 | 11,417 | --- |
| SUBMARINE SONAR DEVELOPMENT | 42,356 | 39,256 | -3,100 |
| AIR CONTROL | 15,898 | 15,898 | --- |
| CHEMICAL WARFARE COUNTERMEASURES | 8,596 | 8,596 | --- |
| NAVY STANDARD SIGNAL PROCESSORS | 20,463 | 20,463 | --- |
| RADAR SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT | 4,655 | 4,655 | --- |
| SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROGRAM | 5,648 | 5,648 | --- |
| SHIP SURVIVABILITY | 6,269 | 6,269 | --- |
| COMBAT INFORMATION CENTER CONVERSION | 29,961 | 25,163 | -4,798 |
| SUBMARINE COMBAT SYSTEM | 346,729 | 346,729 | --- |
| SSN-21 DEVELOPMENTS | 186,893 | 186,893 | --- |
| SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM | 75,017 | 75,017 | --- |
| SHIP SUBSYSTEM DEVELOPMENT/LAND BASED TEST SITE | 37,538 | 32,538 | -5,000 |
| NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES | 31,794 | 31,794 | --- |
| LINK BIRCH | --- | --- | --- |
| MINE DEVELOPMENT | 12,444 | 12,444 | --- |
| NAVAL GUNNERY IMPROVEMENTS | 16,765 | 16,765 | --- |
| ASSAULT BALLISTIC ROCKET SYSTEM | --- | --- | --- |
| UNGUIDED CONVENTIONAL AIR-LAUNCHED WEAPONS | 7,735 | 3,678 | -4,057 |
| SURFACE ELECTRO-OPTIC SYSTEM | 10,678 | 10,678 | --- |
| BOMB FUZE IMPROVEMENT | 15,347 | 15,347 | --- |
| MK 50 TORPEDO | 39,038 | 39,038 | --- |
| MARINE CORPS MINE COUNTERMEASURES SYSTEMS - ENG DEV | 31,025 | 7,078 | -23,947 |
| JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT | 6,076 | 6,076 | --- |
| MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES - ENG DEV | 22,934 | 18,934 | -4,000 |
| MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYS-ENG DEV | 204 | 204 | --- |
| ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE OCEANOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT | 967 | 967 | --- |
| OVER-THE-HORIZON TARGETING | 4,142 | 4,142 | --- |
| NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM | 3,455 | 3,455 | --- |
| SURFACE ASW SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT | 122,609 | 99,995 | -22,614 |
| SURFACE WARFARE TRAINING DEVICES | 12,357 | 12,357 | --- |
| MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT | 3,545 | 3,545 | --- |
| MARINE CORPS INTELLIGENCE/ELECTRONICS WARFARE SYSTEM | 1,182 | 1,182 | --- |
| MARINE CORPS COMMAND/CONTROL/COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS | 13,822 | 11,822 | -2,000 |
| JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS | 24,961 | 22,961 | -2,000 |
| INTELLIGENCE | 2,538 | 2,538 | --- |
| MEDICAL DEVELOPMENTS | 3,999 | 3,999 | --- |
| SOLDIER/MARINE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM (MC) | --- | --- | --- |
| JINTACCS MARINE CORPS | 1,104 | 1,104 | --- |
| FIXED DISTRIBUTED SYSTEM - ENG | 210,176 | 210,176 | --- |
| FLEET TACTICAL DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION | 14,936 | 14,936 | --- |
| ELECTROMAGNETIC SPECTRUM MANAGEMENT | 3,642 | 3,642 | --- |
| MANAGEMENT AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT | 9,404 | 8,049 | -1,355 |
| C2 SURVEILLANCE/RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT | 9,983 | 9,450 | -533 |
| A-6 SQUADRONS | 21,457 | 21,457 | --- |
| F/A-18 SQUADRONS | 79,215 | 76,715 | -2,500 |

[In thousands of dollars]

|  | Budget estimate | Committee recom-mendation | Senate compared with budget estimate |
|---|---|---|---|
| EARLY WARNING AIRCRAFT SQUADRONS | 37,450 | 37,450 | --- |
| SEA-BASED ELECTRONIC WARFARE SQUADRONS | 1,703 | 1,703 | --- |
| FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL) | 8,985 | 7,985 | -1,000 |
| SURFACE COMBATANT ORDNANCE AND MISSILES | 33,700 | 33,700 | --- |
| UNDERSEA SURVEILLANCE SYSTEMS | 46,849 | 46,849 | --- |
| SHIP-TOWED ARRAY SURVEILLANCE SYSTEMS | 5,798 | 5,798 | --- |
| AMPHIBIOUS TACTICAL SUPPORT UNITS | 4,097 | 4,097 | --- |
| SPECIAL PROJECTS | 5,064 | 5,064 | --- |
| HARM IMPROVEMENT | --- | --- | --- |
| TACTICAL INFORMATION SYSTEM | 75,999 | 75,999 | --- |
| ASW COMBAT SYSTEMS INTEGRATION | 19,253 | 19,253 | --- |
| AIRCRAFT EQUIPMENT RELIABILITY/MAINTAINABILITY PRO | 1,445 | 1,445 | --- |
| LABORATORY FLEET SUPPORT | 6,796 | 6,796 | --- |
| F-14 UPGRADE | 121,428 | 121,428 | --- |
| TACTICAL INTELLIGENCE PROCESSING | 4,895 | 4,895 | --- |
| OPERATIONAL REACTOR DEVELOPMENT | 56,614 | 56,614 | --- |
| MARINE CORPS TELECOMMUNICATIONS | 5,485 | 5,485 | --- |
| MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS | 43,725 | 55,725 | +12,000 |
| MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT | 1,839 | 1,839 | --- |
| MARINE CORPS INTELLIGENCE/ELECTRONICS WARFARE SYSTEMS. | 34,053 | 34,053 | --- |
| MARINE CORPS COMMAND/CONTROL/COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS | 27,018 | 27,018 | --- |
| TACIT RAINBOW | --- | --- | --- |
| JOINT TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM (TRI-TAC) | 2,010 | 2,010 | --- |
| FORCE ENHANCEMENTS-ACTIVE | --- | --- | --- |
| CLASSIFIED PROGRAM | --- | --- | --- |
| FEWSG AIRCRAFT COMPETITION | --- | --- | --- |
| DISTRIBUTED SIMULATION - NAVY RESERVE | --- | --- | --- |
| TORPEDO DETECTION PROCESSOR | --- | --- | --- |
| CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 1,069,500 | 1,069,500 | --- |
| TOTAL, TACTICAL PROGRAMS | 6,146,247 | 5,639,882 | -506,365 |
| PRIOR YEAR TRANSFER | --- | (200,000) | (+200,000) |
| **INTELLIGENCE & COMMUNICATIONS** |  |  |  |
| WARFARE SUPPORT SYSTEM | 13,605 | 13,605 | --- |
| TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM | 49,614 | 49,614 | --- |
| NAVIGATION SYSTEMS | 5,339 | 5,339 | --- |
| EHF SATCOM | 17,579 | 17,579 | --- |
| NAVSTAR GPS | 52,396 | 52,396 | --- |
| NAVY COMMAND AND CONTROL PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT | 3,139 | 3,139 | --- |
| SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS | 13,723 | 12,223 | -1,500 |
| MILSTAR SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM | 4,591 | --- | -4,591 |
| CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 713,654 | 713,654 | --- |
| TOTAL, INTELLIGENCE & COMMUNICATIONS | 873,640 | 867,549 | -6,091 |
| **DEFENSEWIDE MISSION SUPPORT** |  |  |  |
| ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION | 11,560 | 11,560 | --- |
| RANGE INSTRUMENTATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT (RISD) | 9,789 | 9,789 | --- |
| ELECTRONIC WARFARE SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT | 39,577 | 29,414 | -10,163 |
| TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 53,939 | 53,939 | --- |
| PERSONNEL, TRAINING, SIMULATION, AND HUMAN FACTORS | 1,069 | 1,069 | --- |
| STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT - MC | 2,243 | 2,243 | --- |
| STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT - NAVY | 3,782 | 3,782 | --- |
| MARINE CORPS OPERATIONS ANALYSIS GROUP, CNA | 4,549 | 4,549 | --- |
| CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES | 26,196 | 20,876 | -5,320 |
| MARINE CORPS OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION | 958 | 958 | --- |
| TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES | 2,977 | 2,977 | --- |
| INTERNATIONAL RDT&E | 4,042 | 3,037 | -1,005 |
| RDT&E LABORATORY AND FACILITIES MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | 59,655 | 51,847 | -7,808 |
| RDT&E INSTRUMENTATION AND MATERIEL SUPPORT | 22,011 | 22,011 | --- |
| RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT | 85,257 | 73,305 | -11,952 |
| TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT | 345,929 | 317,866 | -28,063 |
| OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY | 6,472 | 6,472 | --- |
| MARINE CORPS TACT EXPLOIT OF NATIONAL CAPABILITIES | 1,863 | 1,863 | --- |
| PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENTS | 715 | 715 | --- |
| WEATHER SERVICE | 1,083 | 1,083 | --- |
| DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SATELLITE PROGRAM (DMSP) | 4,202 | 4,202 | --- |

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget estimate | Committee recom- mendation | Senate compared with budget estimate |
|---|---|---|---|
| INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS | 41,827 | 3,000 | -38,827 |
| USN/USMC MINE WARFARE | --- | 15,697 | +15,697 |
| TEST RANGES BASE OPERATIONS/RPMA | --- | -24,300 | -24,300 |
| NAVY LABORATORIES OVERHEAD | --- | -19,300 | -19,300 |
| FAST SEALIFT TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | --- | --- | --- |
| TOTAL, DEFENSEWIDE MISSION SUPPORT | 729,695 | 598,654 | -131,041 |
| REDUCTION FOR ROBOTICS | --- | --- | --- |
| BONE MARROW RESEARCH | --- | --- | --- |
| UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION (T-45/TRIDENT II) | --- | --- | --- |
| TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL NAVY | 9,102,400 | 8,459,853 | -642,547 |
| PRIOR YEAR TRANSFER | --- | (200,000) | (+200,000) |

## RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $13,635,570,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 13,276,300,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 11,575,574,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $11,575,574,000, a reduction of $1,700,726,000 to the budget request.

### SUMMARY TABLE

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget estimate | Committee recommendation | Change from budget |
|---|---|---|---|
| Technology base | 781,587 | 774,254 | −7,333 |
| Advanced technology development | 646,060 | 469,622 | −176,438 |
| Strategic programs | 4,262,197 | 3,618,284 | −643,913 |
| Tactical programs | 3,777,193 | 3,323,412 | −453,781 |
| Intelligence and communications | 2,265,100 | 2,265,100 | |
| Defensewide mission support | 1,544,163 | 1,124,902 | −419,261 |

The budget activities and programs funded under this appropriation are discussed below.

### CLASSIFIED PROGRAM ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommends the following adjustments to classified programs, as explained in the classified annex to the Committee's report:

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget estimate | Committee recommendation | Compared with budget estimate |
|---|---|---|---|
| Olympic | | −27,575 | −27,575 |
| Relocatable Target Capability Program | 7,049 | −7,049 | −7,049 |
| Omega | | −25,000 | −25,000 |
| Advanced tactical aircraft | | −30,000 | −30,000 |
| Have flag | | +83,000 | +83,000 |

### OTHER ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommends the following adjustments—already approved by the Senate—to the budget request.

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget estimate | Committee recommendation | Compared with budget estimate |
|---|---|---|---|
| NUDET detection system | 5,125 | 23,625 | +18,500 |
| Initial operational test and evaluation | 20,884 | 10,000 | −10,884 |
| Tacit Rainbow | 9,759 | 36,759 | +27,000 |
| C-130J | | 10,000 | +10,000 |

## ADJUSTMENTS BASED ON POOR FINANCIAL EXECUTION IN FISCAL YEAR 1990

The Committee recommends the following adjustments to eliminate funds not expected to be spent in fiscal year 1991, due to slow execution and expenditure of fiscal year 1990 funds:

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget estimate | Committee recommendation | Compared with budget estimate |
|---|---|---|---|
| Tactical air control systems | 17,075 | 15,075 | −2,000 |
| Airborne warning and control system | 133,810 | 118,810 | −15,000 |
| Electronic combat support | 2,770 | 2,070 | −700 |
| Aircraft avionics equipment development | 13,295 | 12,295 | −1,000 |
| Consolidated space operations center | 24,323 | 22,323 | −2,000 |
| Manpower, personnel, and training development | 3,494 | 2,494 | −1,000 |
| R&M maturation/tech insertion program | 19,532 | 17,532 | −2,000 |
| DYCOMS | 3,369 | 2,369 | −1,000 |

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENTS

The fiscal year 1991 budget request included many programs which contain: (*a*) lower priority efforts; (*b*) funds identified by the Air Force as excess to firm program requirements; and (*c*) funds associated with management or institutional support and RDT&E overhead functions. In expectation of the significant contraction of the defense research and development infrastructure due to likely budget constraints, the Committee recommends funding many of these program elements at the fiscal year 1990 level or lower. Any funds identified as excess to firm program needs also are eliminated. The Committee recommends the following adjustments:

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget estimate | Committee recommendation | Compared with budget estimate |
|---|---|---|---|
| In-house lab independent R&D | 8,318 | 7,450 | −868 |
| Defense research sciences | 193,158 | 192,158 | −1,000 |
| Aerospace propulsion subsystems integration (Integrated High Performance Turbine Engine Technology Program [IHPTET] project) | 28,404 | 20,527 | −7,877 |
| Aerospace structures (IHPTET project) | 19,135 | 18,635 | −500 |
| Aerospace propulsion and power tech (IHPTET project) | 40,154 | 34,598 | −5,556 |
| Space and missile rocket propulsion (IHPTET project) | 12,568 | 10,316 | −2,252 |
| Geophysics (IHPTET project) | 36,457 | 35,757 | −700 |
| Engine Model Derivative Program | 1,019 | 519 | −500 |
| Common support equipment | 15,119 | 12,536 | −2,583 |
| National airspace system | 35,000 | 16,000 | −19,000 |
| RDT&E aircraft support | 61,793 | 54,249 | −7,544 |
| Test and evaluation support | 318,639 | 294,352 | −24,287 |
| Weather systems engineering development | 5,361 | 4,775 | −586 |
| Improved capability for development test and evaluation | 45,720 | 37,720 | −8,000 |
| Navigation/radar/sled track | 27,223 | 23,032 | −4,191 |
| International activities | 4,011 | 3,288 | −723 |

## ADDITIONAL MAJOR PROGRAM ADJUSTMENTS AND SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS

*Aerospace flight dynamics.*—The Committee recommends $62,613,000, a reduction of $4,765,000 to the budget request for this technology base program element. The recommendation denies funds for the technology integration and assessment project. This project partly duplicates the functions of the development planning program to perform advanced technology assessments and vehicle concept synthesis to identify future military options available with new technologies. The project also represents excessive funding of long-range technology planning efforts.

*National aerospace plane [NASP] technology program.*—As already approved by the full Senate, the Committee recommends denial of the $158,000,000 requested for the national aerospace plane technology development program. The NASP program seeks to develop test vehicles combining the capabilities of aircraft and space launch boosters, with the goal of being able to take off from a conventional runway and fly to low Earth orbit. The program is estimated to cost more than $5,000,000,000. At this cost, NASP is unaffordable and would divert scarce resources away from higher priority military and civilian space programs.

*Electronic warfare [EW] technology.*—This program element funds advanced technology development projects to improve the electronic combat capabilities of Air Force systems. The Committee recommends $34,686,000, a reduction to the budget request of $2,253,000. Funds are denied for the following projects: (*a*) Agile laser ($126,000); (*b*) $1,127,000 for the MAC (Military Airlift Command) EW suite; and (*c*) $1,000,000 for advanced expendables.

The Agile laser project duplicates Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency [DARPA] work. In addition, the Air Force's last project in this area failed due to cost and technology concerns. The Air Force is directed to cooperate with DARPA to adapt that agency's optical countermeasures project to meet its needs. Similar direction has been given to the Army and the Navy.

The MAC EW suite is premature until more analysis is accomplished on alternatives for countering the threat through active countermeasures, such as those installed recently in Operation Snowstorm, and until more review is given to the proposed operational concept.

The Air Force identified the proposed advanced expendables work as, in actuality, undesignated contingency funds.

*Advanced strategic missile systems [ASMS].*—The Committee recommends $65,700,000 for this program to develop advanced technologies for improving land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles [ICBM's]. This amount represents a reduction of $34,644,000 to the budget request. The recommendation maintains ASMS funding at the fiscal year 1990 level due to lack of firm plans from the Office of the Secretary of Defense [OSD] about which specific technology efforts are of sufficient priority to be pursued in this program. In the past, this program has developed advanced warhead designs, improved missile guidance systems, and defense penetration aids. Unfortunately, ASMS has been marked by significant funding turbulence and changing priorities.

Last year, the Committee required a long-range plan to outline the program's firm priorities and major objectives, and to stabilize its annual funding level. The plan submitted by the Secretary of Defense provides no such firm guidance. It is replete with caveats that a concrete program will not be available until submission of the fiscal year 1992 defense budget. The Committee can have no confidence that funds provided for fiscal year 1991 actually will be invested for projects which will be part of the yet-undetermined program. Constraining ASMS funds to the fiscal year 1990 level minimizes the fiscal risks in this still-evolving program.

The Committee also recommends bill language to prevent any ASMS funds from being used to develop Earth (or other media) penetrating weapons and ICBM-delivered weapons to attack strategic relocatable targets. Language is necessary to prevent duplication of work being funded elsewhere in the defense budget to develop technologies to counter deeply buried targets and relocatable targets.

*Space surveillance technology.*—This program element primarily funds the Air Force's new space-based wide area surveillance program. The Committee denies the $33,138,000 requested to begin this very costly, premature, and possibly duplicative project. A similar recommendation is made in the "Navy RDT&E" account regarding that service's space-based wide area surveillance project. The remaining $1,000,000 in this Air Force program element is approved as requested for the Have Gaze project, and the Committee directs that these funds remain available only for this activity. Further direction and elaboration about the reduction recommended here is contained in the classified annex to this report.

*B-2 advanced technology (Stealth) bomber.*—The Committee recommends $1,750,692,000 for the RDT&E component of the B-2 Stealth bomber program, an increase of $184,000,000 to the budget request. Additional funds are needed in the B-2 R&D program due to decisions by the Secretary of Defense during the major aircraft review. The Secretary decided to revise the fiscal year 1991 procurement request from five to two bombers, lower the maximum annual building rate, and reduce the total projected fleet from 132 to 75 aircraft. The unique contractual and manufacturing conditions in the B-2 program require a recalculation of funding requirements throughout the program whenever the annual procurement profile is modified. The recommended additional funding already has been approved by the full Senate.

*Minuteman squadrons.*—The Committee recommends $82,900,000, a reduction of $4,542,000 to the budget request for this program element to develop modifications and improvements to the Minuteman II and III intercontinental ballistic missiles and associated equipment. The rapid execution and combat targeting [REACT] project to upgrade Minuteman and Peacekeeper launch control centers is included in this program element.

The recommendation fully funds the REACT program, but denies funds for the Minuteman sustaining engineering and research support project. The request for this low-priority project specified advanced guidance system research and development already underway in the advanced strategic missile systems program element. These guidance efforts in the ASMS program are supported by

Congress, despite concerns about the size, composition, and budget trends for the overall ASMS activity. The Minuteman sustaining engineering project also proposed guidance upgrade activities for the Minuteman II and III. This proposal is denied because the Minuteman II system is to be retired in the near future under a Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty. Furthermore, the Air Force already terminated an ongoing Minuteman II guidance computer upgrade program due to high cost. The Committee questions the urgency, affordability, and priority of beginning a new initiative with the same objective as the canceled program. In addition, guidance upgrades for the Minuteman III system already have been implemented and just were completed this year. New efforts would appear to be premature at this time.

*Over-the-horizon backscatter radar [OTH-B].*—The Committee recommends deleting the $12,851,000 requested for further research and development on this land-based radar intended to provide day-to-day warning and assessment of attacks by Soviet bombers and cruise missiles against North America. Funds are denied due to lack of timely and adequate justification by the Air Force. The Committee also questions the need for further R&D for this performance-limited system, since the Air Force late last year canceled an improvement program due to inherent system limitations.

*Ballistic missile early warning system [BMEWS].*—The mission of the ballistic missile early warning system is to detect and provide warning of a ballistic missile attack on the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, and Europe. Ground-based radar sites are located in the United States and overseas. The Committee recommends $18,217,000, a reduction of $4,112,000 to the budget request. The recommendation eliminates funds the Air Force stated were for a possible modification in fiscal year 1992 to a contract to upgrade the BMEWS facility in Fylingsdale, England. Since these funds will not be obligated in fiscal year 1991, and since they may not even be used in fiscal year 1992, they are denied.

*Spacetrack.*—As already approved by the full Senate, the Committee recommends $30,527,000, an increase of $15,000,000 to the budget request for this program element, which develops technologies to maintain and improve Air Force space surveillance capabilities. The Committee directs that the added funds only are available to begin an upgrade of the telescope and facilities of the service's Maui Optical Station [AMOS]. This upgrade project has been designated the advanced electro-optical system [AEOS] by the Air Force.

This AMOS initiative will enhance the Nation's capabilities to detect, identify, and characterize satellites, other space objects, and space debris. The upgrade can contribute to meeting the service's research, development, and operational requirements in the space surveillance area. It also will address the needs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, other Federal agencies, and civilian universities throughout the Nation.

The AEOS project would increase the size of the optical station's current 1.6-meter telescope to one which is almost 4 meters in diameter. This new, more sensitive and precise instrument would be installed in a special modular facility designed to undertake several space tracking experiments almost simultaneously. More modern and effective sensor and data measurement packages would replace current, performance-limited instrumentation.

The results of this upgrade include much higher resolution of space objects for imaging and identification purposes, increased sensitivity for measuring key satellite characteristics, and increased mission availability.

The Committee expects the Air Force to initiate the AMOS upgrade project without delay during fiscal year 1991.

*Defense support program [DSP] follow-on; boost surveillance and tracking system [BSTS]—advanced development.*—The Defense support program system is intended to satisfy the operational requirement for a highly survivable, reliable satellite-borne surveillance system to detect and report missile and space launches and nuclear detonations almost as they occur. DSP's primary mission is to provide tactical warning and attack assessment of a ballistic missile attack. The boost surveillance and tracking system satellite is being developed by the strategic defense initiative [SDI] and the Air Force as a follow-on to DSP to modernize this capability and also provide SDI battle management/command, control, and communications.

The Committee recommends an increase to the budget request of $15,000,000 for DSP follow-on competition activities, along with the transfer of $137,000,000 from SDI to the Air Force for BSTS advanced development. The recommendation reflects the decision, already approved by the full Senate, to fund BSTS advanced development, and a DSP follow-on competition, for a total of $152,000,000 in fiscal year 1991. Bill language is recommended for the "Defense agencies RDT&E" account to implement the transfer of the funds from SDI, which included the same amount in its budget request for BSTS advanced development.

*System survivability (nuclear effects).*—The Committee recommends $4,926,000, a reduction of $3,913,000 to the budget request, for this program to develop and demonstrate the engineering capability to establish and maintain the resistance of Air Force and Defense Department space, aircraft, and missile systems to nuclear weapons effects. The Air Force requested 76 percent real growth in the survivability/vulnerability assessment of aerospace systems project in this program element. The recommendation denies this increase and maintains this project at the fiscal year 1990 level. The following tasks identified as requiring the increase were poorly justified and possibly duplicative of other Defense Department programs: (*a*) feasibility studies and preliminary designs for improved system survivability simulators; (*b*) acquisition of additional test bed vehicles; and (*c*) additional electromagnetic pulse testing.

*Milstar satellite communications system (Air Force terminals); Milstar satellite communications system; Milstar alternative.*—As already approved by the full Senate, the Committee recommends denial of $768,589,000 for development of Milstar satellite communications ground terminals and satellites. It also recommends the addition of $20,000,000 to the budget request to evaluate options for less costly, less complex alternative satellite communications systems. The recommendations are a total of $748,589,000 below the budget request.

*Advanced tactical fighter [ATF]—advanced development and full-scale development.*—The Advanced tactical fighter is the Air Force's next-generation air superiority fighter, and is intended to succeed the F-15 aircraft in that role in the next century. The ATF is to embody enhanced tactical aircraft capabilities, including supersonic cruise, reduced detectability, and increased maintainability.

The Committee recommends adding $106,441,000 to the budget request to extend the demonstration/validation phase of the ATF development program through fiscal year 1991. The $283,000,000 requested to begin ATF full-scale development [FSD] in fiscal year 1991 is denied. These actions already have been approved by the full Senate. They represent a net reduction to the ATF budget request of $176,559,000. Initiation of full-scale development of the ATF in fiscal year 1991 is premature considering the late beginning of flight tests in fiscal year 1990.

*Night/precision attack; A-10 squadrons; F-16 squadrons; follow-on tactical reconnaissance system [FOTRS].*—The Committee recommends deferring or restricting the use of certain funds sought for upgrades to F-16 fighter and A-10 ground attack aircraft due to major uncertainties about the size and composition of the future Air Force tactical combat aircraft force structure. The Air Force has been unable to specify the number of tactical fighter wings, the aircraft types, and the mix of Active and Guard/Reserve units contained in its future plans. Without such information, the Congress can have no confidence that the costly aircraft enhancements it is being asked to fund are not destined for platforms which will be retired before, or shortly after, the upgrades are installed. The affordability and priority of these upgrade programs also should be reconsidered in view of expected budget limits. The Committee's recommendations give Congress the opportunity during the fiscal year 1992 budget deliberations to reevaluate the viability and cost effectiveness of these upgrade programs.

The Committee recommendations are: (*a*) deny the $1,983,000 request for the A-10 squadrons program element; (*b*) provide $25,856,000, a reduction of $44,200,000 to the budget request for the F-16 squadrons program element; (*c*) approve $46,478,000 for the FOTRS program element, a reduction to the budget request of the $770,000 for the RF-16 project; (*d*) restrict the obligation of $6,000,000 for night vision enhancements for close air support [CAS] aircraft until OSD selects the future CAS aircraft which will carry these upgrades; and (*e*) prevent the obligation of $14,400,000 for the F-16 midlife upgrade joint project with four NATO allies until the Air Force demonstrates its future force structure will retain long enough the 130 very early U.S. aircraft to be modified.

More specifically, the Committee recommended deferring $39,300,000 in the F-16 squadrons program element and $1,983,000 in the A-10 squadrons program element for close air support upgrades to older F-16 and A-10 aircraft as interim CAS aircraft. Since OSD is to choose a new CAS aircraft soon, the interim CAS upgrade program should be reevaluated. Also deferred is another $4,900,000 in the F-16 program element for a new start, CAS-related avionics upgrade to the newest F-16's, the block 50 aircraft. The Committee questions whether this upgrade will be redundant or militarily justified once the new close air support aircraft is chosen, and whether an enhancement to the block 50 aircraft is premature. Block 50 F-16's are just entering the active inventory.

The Committee defers the $770,000 in the follow-on-tactical reconnaissance system program element as a premature request for a new start to develop a reconnaissance variant of the F-16—the RF-16. Development of such an aircraft will require a large investment of resources. To assist the Congress in evaluating any proposed RF-16 program, the Committee requests the Secretary of Defense to submit a detailed report on the costs, benefits, and affordability of any such proposal. The Committee further expects that this report also will address the survivability and cost effectiveness of any RF-16. The report should provide a detailed comparison of the performance, in these categories, of any RF-16 options being proposed with tactical reconnaissance capabilities based on unmanned aerial vehicles and space systems dedicated or tasked to tactical support missions.

The budget request sought $7,692,000 in the night/precision attack program element. This amount included $6,000,000 to develop night vision enhancements for CAS aircraft, especially for the A-16, the Air Force candidate for the new CAS platform. The Committee directs that this latter amount may not be obligated or expended until OSD chooses the future CAS aircraft, and that these funds may then be used only for developments related to that particular aircraft.

The F-16 squadrons program element also contained $14,400,000 for the midlife upgrade joint effort with The Netherlands, Belgium, Denmark, and Norway to upgrade 130 very old United States F-16's and F-16's owned by these NATO allies. The Committee directs that these funds may not be obligated or expended until the Air Force provides Congress with its future force structure and aircraft retirement plans which demonstrate that these 130 aircraft will remain in the U.S. operating inventory long enough to justify the program investment.

*Integrated EW (electronic warfare)/CNI (communications, navigation, identification) development.*—The Committee recommends $10,868,000, a reduction of $5,740,000 to the budget request for this avionics development program. Funds are denied for the Seek Spartan project, which adapts the advanced modular electronic warfare avionics of the advanced tactical fighter [ATF] for possible retrofit into existing Air Force aircraft. This project is premature. ATF avionics still are under development and are not sufficiently mature to be used as the basis for integrating upgrades into other aircraft.

*Aircraft engine component improvement program.*—The Committee denies the $12,561,000 requested for new start projects in this program to improve components of currently deployed military aircraft engines. The $81,000,000 recommended by the Committee will fully fund projects associated with maintaining safety of flight and ongoing projects. The same recommendation was made for a similar Navy program.

*Electronic warfare [EW] development.*—This program consists of approximately 19 projects to develop enhanced electronic combat systems and countermeasures for Air Force aircraft. The recommendation defers or eliminates funds associated with unstable or premature programs, and funds identified as excess to known project requirements. The Committee recommends $65,881,000, a reduction of $93,470,000 to the budget request. The specific actions are explained below.

The Committee reduced $10,800,000 from the EF-111A System Improvement Program to upgrade the tactical jamming capabilities of the EF-111 Raven EW aircraft. Of this total amount, $8,500,000 is available due to a 3-month slip in contract award in fiscal year 1991 and $2,300,000 was identified by the Air Force as excess to known program requirements.

The request for $4,500,000 for the on-board electronic warfare simulator project for the F-16 aircraft is denied. This project is unstable because changes since the budget request have modified completely the proposed effort. Funds associated with a pod-mounted system now are to be used for developing a system for internal aircraft carriage, and a different radar warning receiver now will be integrated. Award of the full-scale development contract has slipped almost 10 months.

The $14,000,000 requested for the airlift defensive systems project is deferred. This project also is unstable, since it was significantly restructured after the budget request. Furthermore, installation of several EW systems aboard airlift aircraft engaged in Operation Snowstorm in fiscal year 1990 now can serve as a prototyping effort for this project. The Air Force should gain operational experience with these systems and aircraft before it pursues this alternative effort. Finally, execution and expenditures for this effort in fiscal year 1990 are low.

The Committee provides $9,000,000 and eliminates $18,700,000 for the self-defense suite [SDS] for the joint surveillance/target attack radar system [JSTARS] aircraft. The amount approved is essentially the funding level for fiscal year 1990. Use of these funds is restricted as explained in the classified annex of the report. The recommendation prevents excessive concurrency in buying test assets for this EW suite and modifying test aircraft before the systems specifications are fully defined. It also avoids premature commitment to a program costing more than $500,000,000, especially since the overall size of the JSTARS fleet, and it utility in non-European scenarios, remain undetermined.

The Committee recommends deferral of the $45,470,000 for the B-1B radar warning receiver [RWR] development project. This project was significantly restructured after the budget request amid indications that the Strategic Air Command assigned higher risk to the development effort. The recommended action avoids premature commitment to a $487,000,000 program while decisions about the future composition of the air-breathing leg of the strategic deterrent TRIAD are unsettled, and until the basic capabilities of the deficient B-1B electronic countermeasures [ECM] system are independently evaluated next year.

The proposed radar warning receiver is to compensate, in part, for deficiencies in the current ECM suite, known as the ALQ-161A CORE configuration. However, the full extent of these deficiencies will not be available until this independent evaluation. With this baseline unknown, and considering the TRIAD-related issues, deferral of the RWR project gives Congress the opportunity to review its viability and affordability in the next budget cycle.

To preserve all options with respect to upgrading the B-1B bomber, and to maintain adequate congressional oversight of the status of the CORE program, the Committee also recommends repeating section 9071 of the Defense Appropriations Act, 1990 in the fiscal year 1991 act. Section 9071 requires advance notification to Congress of the use of any Defense Department funds for the ALQ-161A CORE program and prevents use of any funds for radar warning receiver activities.

*Armament/ordnance development.*—This program element primarily contains funds to develop the direct airfield attack combined munition [DAACM]. DAACM was canceled by OSD in the fiscal years 1992–97 defense spending plan. Accordingly, the Committee denies the $10,274,000 requested for full-scale development [FSD] of the munition and approves only $563,000 for other activities. In addition, the Air Force has failed to justify the requirement and present a firm program plan for this weapon, which was to be targeted primarily against Warsaw Pact airfields.

*Life support systems.*—The Committee recommends $11,586,000, a reduction of $1,000,000 to the budget request, for this program element to improve aircrew flight equipment and promote other flight safety enhancements. The reduction is made possible due to a 6-month delay in the contract award for development of a new computer hardware and software program to collect and interpret data on aircraft accidents. The delay from July 1990, to January 1991, in obligating fiscal year 1990 funds to begin the Aircraft Mishap Prevention Program permits 6 months' worth of newly requested funding to be eliminated.

*Combat identification systems (Mark-15 identification friend-or-foe).*—The Mark-15 identification friend-or-foe [IFF] program is a major effort among several NATO allies and the United States to improve their ability to identify friendly and hostile aircraft automatically during combat. The program includes developing new aircraft and ground-based interrogate-and-receive equipment.

Late last year, the Defense Department terminated the Mark-15, and the budget request contained no funds for the program. However, since submission of the budget request, the Defense Department has restarted the effort. It remains very unclear whether the Mark-15 remains a high priority within the Pentagon. Changes in the threat facing NATO and the budget constraints affecting all Alliance members also require the Committee to question whether allied participants in the Mark-15 IFF are as strongly committed to the program as in the past.

In view of these uncertainties, the Committee is reluctant to provide any additional funding for the Mark-15 IFF unless the NATO participants have demonstrated their continued, strong commitment to the effort and have provided sufficient funding for their shares of the program. Accordingly, the Air Force is directed to take no actions which would prejudice continuation of the Mark-15 IFF program and to report expeditiously as to the intentions of individual NATO nations about continuing their participation in the program.

*Joint surveillance/target attack radar system [JSTARS].*—The Committee recommends $140,483,000, a reduction of $92,000,000 to the budget request, for this program. JSTARS is an airborne surveillance system intended to identify and track, for targeting purposes, an adversary's ground forces far behind the forward line of troops. Conceived primarily for the NATO Europe war scenario, the aircraft may have potential military utility in other regions. The Committee urges the Air Force to accelerate, if possible, its planned early operational demonstration flight tests in locations other than Europe, and to consider flight tests in additional regions of military interest.

The recommended reduction includes $50,000,000 in anticipation of the Air Force receiving a similar amount from sale of the new E-6A airframe originally purchased for the program. JSTARS now will be carried by used Boeing 707 aircraft as a cost savings measure. Another $15,000,000 was eliminated because the Air Force identified an equal amount of fiscal year 1990 funds which will remain unobligated and available to finance fiscal year 1991 efforts.

The JSTARS request also contained $14,000,000 for excessive management support, which the Committee deletes. The request included $15,200,000 for generic engineering and technical support and $13,100,000 for specific engineering and technical support. With the program apparently overcoming its past, major technical hurdles and now reporting positive test results, the Air Force has been unable to justify adequately this requested level of engineering overhead.

The Committee also recommended reductions of $10,700,000 for readiness improvements, and $2,300,000 for integrated logistics support analysis to support an expanded fleet size of 22 aircraft. Since the basic readiness posture of the aircraft has yet to be firmly defined, and since the ultimate JSTARS fleet size remains undetermined and a subject of disagreement between OSD and the Air Force, these efforts are premature.

*F-15E squadrons.*—The Committee recommends $67,510,000, a reduction of $21,600,000 to the budget request, for this program to develop technologies to maintain and improve the capabilities of the F-15E dual-role fighter, which has both an air superiority and ground attack mission. The recommendation deletes: (*a*) $5,200,000 for a low-priority, new start project to integrate the global positioning system into the aircraft; (*b*) $9,400,000 for an unjustified, unprojected increase in flight test costs; and (*c*) $7,000,000 due to slow execution and expenditures in fiscal year 1990. This amount of fiscal year 1990 funds is expected to be available to finance an equal amount of work in fiscal year 1991.

*Advanced medium-range air-to-air missile [AMRAAM].*—This program element primarily funds preplanned product improvements [P$^3$I] to the Air Force's newest medium-range, radar-guided air intercept missile. AMRAAM is intended as a follow-on to the current Sparrow missile. The P$^3$I program is developing improved electronic countercounter measures [ECCM] for AMRAAM and missile configuration changes for compressed carriage capability to increase the number which can be carried by the advanced tactical fighter [ATF]. The Committee recommends $18,116,000, a reduction of $7,400,000 to the budget request. The action fully funds the ECCM upgrades but denies funds for the ATF compressed carriage capability at this time.

The compressed carriage work is premature, since the current AMRAAM configuration is not settled due to continuing reliability problems. In addition, full-scale development of the ATF is expected to be deferred by at least 3 months, and will last for 2 years longer based on the major aircraft review decisions. Therefore, more time is available to develop AMRAAM compressed carriage capability after the missile configuration is firm.

*Mission planning systems.*—This program develops the computer hardware and software for automated route planning for aircraft and other weapons during peacetime and combat. The Committee approves $8,146,000 for fiscal year 1991, a reduction to the budget request of $10,000,000. Funds are deleted for a new start project associated with future, undesignated weapons and aircraft systems, and for modifications to current planning systems associated with weapons experiencing developmental and deployment delays.

*Space test program.*—The Committee recommends $51,524,000, the same amount as the budget request for this program to launch test payloads on unmanned rocket boosters and the space shuttle. The recommendation includes: (*a*) a decrease of $2,573,000 to reduce funding to the fiscal year 1990 level; (*b*) deletion of $3,000,000 from the space shuttle sorties missions project in recognition of delays in shuttle flights in fiscal year 1990 and the impact of those delays on fiscal year 1991 launches; (*c*) reduction of $3,427,000 due to the program's low priority within the Air Force; and (*d*) addition of $9,000,000 for the high-frequency active auroral research program [HAARP].

The Committee continues to support the HAARP joint Navy-Air Force research initiative to evaluate the potential exploitation of the auroral ionospheric field for possible defense and civilian uses. The joint management by Office of Naval Research and the Air Force Geophysics Laboratory has made considerable progress during fiscal year 1990, and the Committee commends their efforts.

For fiscal year 1991, the recommended amount is to continue research activities, and for long-lead acquisition of transmission and power generation equipment to support HAARP. None of the funds may be obligated until the Office of Naval Research and the Air Force Geophysics Laboratory report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on the continued competitive process for HAARP research, and the obligation schedule for fiscal year 1991 funds.

The Committee directs that none of the recommended, total reduction be assessed against any Pegasus-related activities.

*Advanced aerial target development.*—This program develops aerial targets for testing of air-to-air missiles. The Committee recommends $11,209,000, a reduction of $5,000,000 to the budget request. The recommendation provides a less steep increase in funding for the development of the QF-4 target due to uncertain testing requirements in the future.

*Training systems development.*—The Committee recommends $39,220,000, a reduction of $2,000,000 for this program to develop software and simulators for Air Force air crew training. The action deletes $1,550,000 for a set of analyses that are premature and poorly justified. The project containing these study funds ends in fiscal year 1990, and the proposed follow-on analyses are unrelated to the original project. The action also deletes $450,000 based on the low priority assigned to this program by the Air Force.

*Advanced launch system [ALS].*—The Committee recommends $25,000,000, a reduction of $35,314,000 to the budget request, for this program to develop technologies to reduce space launch costs. The recommendation reduces the level of effort in this program pending Air Force decisions in the fiscal years 1992–97 defense spending plan how to again modify the activity to yield useful upgrades for current Air Force space launch boosters.

The ALS program was intended to fund Air Force, NASA, and strategic defense initiative efforts to develop a family of new, inexpensive unmanned rocket boosters, especially a new heavy-lift launch vehicle. Earlier this year, the program was totally restructured into a technology development effort supposedly designed to transition low-cost space launch technologies into current boosters. However, the recommendation also reduces the program because no firm transition plans exist to transfer any technologies into current launchers, and because there is no established military requirement for a heavy lift launch capability exceeding current boosters.

*Range improvement.*—The Committee recommends $78,828,000, a reduction of $22,100,000 to the budget request for this program to develop test range instrumentation and simulators that replicate threat air defense systems. The Air Force recently canceled one threat simulator under development in this program and has been unable to obligate funds on time for three others. This recommendation reduces funds associated with these four projects: (*a*) other lab/hybrid simulator, $1,400,000; (*b*) AAA(2S6), $200,000; (*c*) AECMAS, $500,000; and (*d*) Have Pewter, $20,000,000.

*Development planning.*—The Committee approves the budget request of $9,138,000 for this program element to perform the long-range planning and the acquisition documentation needed to understand the viability, cost effectiveness, schedule, and other critical aspects of major new development programs before they begin. The Air Force assigned a low priority to this program element in the past. However, the Committee understands the service intends to increase that priority and to manage these activities more carefully in the future. In view of these promised changes, the Committee directs the service to submit a firm program plan listing specific study projects 30 days before funds are obligated. Also, any changes in program funding from the enacted, fiscal year 1991 appropriated level must be notified in advance to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

*Real property maintenance—RDT&E; base operations—RDT&E.*—The Committee recommends consolidating these two RDT&E overhead program elements to give the Air Force more flexibility in managing these funds between the two functions. A similar recommendation was made with respect to the Army's program elements for these activities. The recommendation provides $143,266,000, a reduction of $10,839,000 from the combined budget request due to overall budget constraints and the expected contraction of the defense research infrastructure.

*Medium launch vehicles (space boosters).*—The Committee recommends $191,807,000, a reduction of $42,490,000 to the budget request, for this program to develop the unmanned space boosters and upper stage rocket propulsion systems used to deploy military satellites. The program also funds various rocket launch and test facilities.

Included in this recommendation is the deletion of $31,900,000 for continuing design work on the SLC–6 west coast space launch complex for the Titan IV booster. Fiscal year 1990 funds totaling $31,200,000 were obligated only in late August 1990, for the same purpose. Until the just-obligated work actually is accomplished, additional funding would appear premature.

The addition of $2,510,000 is recommended only for range safety upgrades for fiscal year 1991 for the northern latitude missile test facility.

The Committee continues to support the program to upgrade the only northern latitude missile test facility available to the Department of Defense, NASA, and the American research community. Critical range safety upgrades have been identified that are essential to the upgrade program, and support for DOD launches.

The Committee also directs the Air Force to report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations not later than February 15, 1991, on the designation of the northern latitude missile test facility as part of the major range and test facilities base [MRTFB]. The Committee believes adding the northern latitude missile test facility to this program will lead to maximum utilization of the range and substantial economies for DOD, NASA, and civilian users.

The recommendation also eliminates $9,000,000 for construction of east coast launch complex 40 and $4,100,000 for the Air Force small launch vehicle [SLV]. The Air Force identified the construction funds as unneeded by the contractor in fiscal year 1991. The SLV funds are denied because the booster is intended to support the low-priority space test program and because the Air Force initially failed to properly identify the proposed use of the funds for this project. Overall defense budget constraints strongly mitigate against programs to support low-priority efforts.

*Industrial preparedness.*—As already approved by the full Senate, the Committee recommends transferring the $72,133,000 requested by the Air Force for manufacturing technology development to a new, consolidated program element under the auspices of OSD. Similar recommendations are made with respect to the Army, Navy, and Defense Logistics Agency manufacturing technology program elements. Further direction regarding items of Committee special interest in this joint program is contained in the "Defense agencies RDT&E" section of the report.

*Lincoln Laboratory; Project Air Force; Aerospace Corp.; Mitre $C^3I$ Division.*—As part of its initiative to eliminate exorbitant growth in funding for defense federally funded research and development centers [FFRDC's], the Committee recommends budget reductions for the Air Force's four major FFRDC's. The reductions represent the shares each of these organizations should absorb as part of the

Committee's overall action to reduce total defense FFRDC funding to the fiscal year 1987 level, as adjusted for inflation. Fiscal year 1987 was the peak year of defense RDT&E funding during the last decade.

Full justification and direction for implementing this recommendation are contained in the introduction to the RDT&E section of the report. Although for accounting purposes, the recommendation is assessed against Air Force RDT&E program elements and funding, the Committee intends that the reductions be applied against total fiscal year 1991 funding for each of the FFRDC's. The total funding for each organization includes direct appropriations through RDT&E program elements (in two cases) plus additional Defense Department contract funds.

The recommended funding for each FFRDC is: (*a*) $395,410,000 for Lincoln Laboratory, a reduction of $54,590,000 to the request; (*b*) $21,571,000 for the Rand Corp.'s Project Air Force, a reduction of $3,040,000 (Project Air Force's total fiscal year 1991 funding was requested at $25,100,000); (*c*) $391,020,000 for the Aerospace Corp., a reduction of $53,980,000 to the request; and (*d*) $402,440,000 for the Mitre C$^3$I Division, a reduction of $55,560,000.

*Pseudomorphic materials.*—The Committee understands that the Air Force Office of Scientific Research [AFOSR] intends to spend $4,300,000 to conduct research on pseudomorphic materials, which are materials with rearranged molecules to form advanced semiconductor devices. These devices may have the potential to process information much faster than current technologies. The Committee notes this amount is a 10-percent increase above the fiscal year 1990 level for this important research, which has the potential to benefit several defense critical technologies. This increase will hopefully fund an expansion of AFOSR work to include the study of related material deposition methods, surface structures and molecular assemblies as well as electromagnetic propagation characteristics of these and related materials. The Committee directs that no reductions be made in this amount of planned resources during fiscal year 1991.

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget estimate | Committee recom-mendation | Senate compared with budget estimate |
|---|---|---|---|
| RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL AF | | | |
| TECHNOLOGY BASE | | | |
| IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH | 8,318 | 7,450 | -868 |
| DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES | 193,158 | 192,158 | -1,000 |
| GEOPHYSICS | 36,457 | 35,757 | -700 |
| MATERIALS | 60,847 | 60,847 | --- |
| AEROSPACE FLIGHT DYNAMICS | 67,378 | 62,613 | -4,765 |
| HUMAN SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY | 51,142 | 51,142 | --- |
| AEROSPACE PROPULSION | 62,583 | 62,583 | --- |
| AEROSPACE AVIONICS | 68,614 | 68,614 | --- |
| PERSONNEL, TRAINING AND SIMULATION | 30,488 | 30,488 | --- |
| CIVIL ENGINEERING AND ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY | 5,615 | 5,615 | --- |
| ROCKET PROPULSION | 37,873 | 37,873 | --- |
| ADVANCED WEAPONS | 36,193 | 36,193 | --- |
| CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS | 43,512 | 43,512 | --- |
| COMMAND CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS | 79,409 | 79,409 | --- |
| SCIENTIFIC TECHNICAL INFORMATION PROGRAM | --- | --- | --- |
| TOTAL, TECHNOLOGY BASE | 781,587 | 774,254 | -7,333 |
| ADVANCE TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | | | |
| LOGISTICS SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY | 11,758 | 11,758 | --- |
| INEWS/ICNIA | 29,572 | 29,572 | --- |
| ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS | 15,042 | 15,042 | --- |
| AEROSPACE PROPULSION SUBSYSTEMS INTEGRATION | 28,404 | 20,527 | -7,877 |
| ADVANCED AVIONICS FOR AEROSPACE VEHICLES | 32,308 | 32,308 | --- |
| AEROSPACE VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY | 21,338 | 21,338 | --- |
| AEROSPACE STRUCTURES | 19,135 | 18,635 | -500 |
| AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY | 40,154 | 34,598 | -5,556 |
| PERSONNEL, TRAINING AND SIMULATION TECHNOLOGY | 8,198 | 8,198 | --- |
| CREW SYSTEMS AND PERSONNEL PROTECTION TECHNOLOGY | 18,319 | 18,319 | --- |
| ADVANCED FIGHTER TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION | 23,803 | 23,803 | --- |
| LINCOLN LABORATORY | 27,609 | 27,609 | --- |
| ADVANCED AVIONICS INTEGRATION | 15,079 | 15,079 | --- |
| NATIONAL AERO SPACE PLANE TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM | 158,000 | --- | -158,000 |
| EW TECHNOLOGY | 36,939 | 34,686 | -2,253 |
| SPACE AND MISSILE ROCKET PROPULSION | 12,568 | 10,316 | -2,252 |
| ARMAMENT TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION | 1,219 | 1,219 | --- |
| ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY | 13,023 | 13,023 | --- |
| SPACE SYSTEMS ENVIRONMENTAL INTERACTIONS TECHNOLOGY | 4,252 | 4,252 | --- |
| CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS | 29,497 | 29,497 | --- |
| ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY | 55,904 | 55,904 | --- |
| WEATHER SYSTEMS - ADV DEV | 5,622 | 5,622 | --- |
| CIVIL AND ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY | 10,170 | 10,170 | --- |
| C3I SUBSYSTEM INTEGRATION | 9,446 | 9,446 | --- |
| ADVANCED COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY | 9,073 | 9,073 | --- |
| C3 ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT | 9,628 | 9,628 | --- |
| ADV SPECIAL OPERATIONS RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT AND ACQ | --- | --- | --- |
| TOTAL, ADVANCE TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 646,060 | 469,622 | -176,438 |
| STRATEGIC PROGRAMS | | | |
| OLYMPIC | --- | -27,575 | -27,575 |
| ADVANCED STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS | 100,344 | 65,700 | -34,644 |
| RELOCATABLE TARGET CAPABILITY PROGRAM | 7,049 | --- | -7,049 |
| SPACE SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY | 34,138 | 1,000 | -33,138 |
| DSP FOLLOW-ON | --- | 15,000 | +15,000 |
| BSTS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT (TRANSFER FROM OTHER ACCOUNT | --- | (137,000) | (+137,000) |
| B-2 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY BOMBER | 1,566,692 | 1,750,692 | +184,000 |
| SHORT RANGE ATTACK MISSILE II (SRAM II) - ENG DEV | 156,882 | 156,882 | --- |
| ICBM MODERNIZATION | 757,671 | 757,671 | --- |
| PEACEKEEPER | (7,463) | (7,463) | --- |
| SMALL ICBM | (202,159) | (202,159) | --- |
| RAIL MOBILE MX | (548,049) | (548,049) | --- |
| AIR LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM) | --- | --- | --- |
| SYSTEMS SURVIVABILITY (NUCLEAR EFFECTS) | 8,839 | 4,926 | -3,913 |
| ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE | 52,307 | 52,307 | --- |

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget estimate | Committee recommendation | Senate compared with budget estimate |
|---|---|---|---|
| KC-135 SQUADRONS | 3,573 | 3,573 | --- |
| MINUTEMAN SQUADRONS | 87,442 | 82,900 | -4,542 |
| PACCS AND WWABNCP SYSTEM EC-135 CLASS V MODS | 1,278 | 1,278 | --- |
| WAR PLANNING AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING (ADP) - SAC | 4,764 | 4,764 | --- |
| NCMC - TW/AA SYSTEMS | 104,899 | 104,899 | --- |
| JOINT SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM | 1,678 | 1,678 | --- |
| SURVEILLANCE RADAR STATIONS/SITES | 8,204 | 8,204 | --- |
| DISTANT EARLY WARNING (DEW) RADAR STATIONS | 1,047 | 1,047 | --- |
| OVER-THE-HORIZON BACKSCATTER RADAR | 12,851 | --- | -12,851 |
| BALLISTIC MISSILE EARLY WARNING SYSTEM (BMEWS) | 22,329 | 18,217 | -4,112 |
| SPACETRACK | 15,527 | 30,527 | +15,000 |
| DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM | 69,990 | 69,990 | --- |
| SUBMARINE-LAUNCHED BALLISTIC MISSILE RADAR WARN SYS | 2,294 | 2,294 | --- |
| NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM | 5,125 | 23,625 | +18,500 |
| MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK | 9,677 | 9,677 | --- |
| WORLD-WIDE MILITARY COMMAND & CONTROL SYS, INFO SYS | 1,540 | 1,540 | --- |
| MILSTAR SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM (AF TERMINALS) | 24,425 | --- | -24,425 |
| MILSTAR SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM | 744,164 | --- | -744,164 |
| MILSTAR ALTERNATIVE | --- | 20,000 | +20,000 |
| ADVANCED WARNING SYSTEM | --- | --- | --- |
| B-1B PROGRAM | --- | --- | --- |
| CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 457,468 | 457,468 | --- |
| TOTAL, STRATEGIC PROGRAMS | 4,262,197 | 3,618,284 | -643,913 |
| (TRANSFER FROM OTHER ACCOUNTS) | --- | (137,000) | (+137,000) |
| TACTICAL PROGRAMS | | | |
| ADVANCED TACTICAL FIGHTER | 763,923 | 870,364 | +106,441 |
| INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT | 4,382 | 4,382 | --- |
| AIR BASE OPERABILITY ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT | 3,430 | 3,430 | --- |
| LOW COST ANTI-RADIATION SEEKER | --- | --- | --- |
| COMMAND, CONTROL, AND COMMUNICATION APPLICATIONS | 8,221 | 8,221 | --- |
| COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY | 2,026 | 2,026 | --- |
| AIRCRAFT AVIONICS EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT | 13,295 | 12,295 | -1,000 |
| AIRCRAFT EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT | 2,942 | 2,942 | --- |
| ENGINE MODEL DERIVATIVE PROGRAM (EMDP) | 1,019 | 519 | -500 |
| NUCLEAR WEAPONS SUPPORT | 2,838 | 2,838 | --- |
| ALTERNATE FIGHTER ENGINE | 5,104 | 5,104 | --- |
| C-17 PROGRAM | 541,081 | 541,081 | --- |
| TANKER, TRANSPORT, BOMBER TRAINING SYSTEM | 2,401 | 2,401 | --- |
| INFRARED SEARCH AND TRACK SYSTEM | --- | --- | --- |
| VARIABLE STABILITY IN-FLIGHT SIMULATOR TEST AIRCRAFT | 7,316 | 7,316 | --- |
| ADVANCED TACTICAL FIGHTER FSD | 283,441 | --- | -283,441 |
| ADVANCED TACTICAL AIRCRAFT | --- | -30,000 | -30,000 |
| SHORT RANGE ATTACK MISSILE - TACTICAL (SRAM-T) | 118,581 | 118,581 | --- |
| MODULAR AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT | 13,047 | 13,047 | --- |
| NIGHT/PRECISION ATTACK | 7,692 | 7,692 | --- |
| INTEGRATED EW/CNI DEVELOPMENT | 16,608 | 10,868 | -5,740 |
| AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM | 93,561 | 81,000 | -12,561 |
| EW DEVELOPMENT | 159,351 | 65,881 | -93,470 |
| HARDENED TARGET MUNITIONS | --- | --- | --- |
| CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT | 8,350 | 8,350 | --- |
| ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT | 10,837 | 563 | -10,274 |
| SUBMUNITIONS | 7,596 | 7,596 | --- |
| WIDE-AREA, ANTI-ARMOR MUNITIONS | 23,879 | 23,879 | --- |
| AIR BASE OPERABILITY | 6,512 | 6,512 | --- |
| AEROMEDICAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 7,499 | 7,499 | --- |
| COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT | 15,119 | 12,536 | -2,583 |
| LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS | 12,586 | 11,586 | -1,000 |
| CIVIL, FIRE, ENVIRONMENTAL, SHELTER ENGINEERING | 2,191 | 2,191 | --- |
| COMBAT IDENTIFICATION SYSTEMS | --- | --- | --- |
| SURFACE DEFENSE SUPPRESSION | 11,158 | 11,158 | --- |
| COMPUTER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT TECHNOLOGY | 12,610 | 12,610 | --- |
| INTELLIGENCE EQUIPMENT | 3,911 | 3,911 | --- |
| JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS) | 38,312 | 38,312 | --- |
| SIDE LOOKING AIRBORNE RADAR | 4,135 | 4,135 | --- |
| JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM (JSTARS) | 232,483 | 140,483 | -92,000 |
| JOINT INTEROPERABILITY OF TACT COMMAND & CONTROL SYS | 6,632 | 6,632 | --- |
| F-111 SQUADRONS | 11,317 | 11,317 | --- |
| F-15A/B/C/D SQUADRONS | --- | --- | --- |
| A-10 SQUADRONS | 1,983 | --- | -1,983 |

[In thousands of dollars]

|  | Budget estimate | Committee recom-mendation | Senate compared with budget estimate |
|---|---|---|---|
| F-16 SQUADRONS | 70,056 | 25,856 | -44,200 |
| F-15E SQUADRONS | 89,110 | 67,510 | -21,600 |
| F-4G WILD WEASEL SQUADRONS | --- | --- | --- |
| F-117A SQUADRONS | --- | --- | --- |
| TACTICAL AGM MISSILES | 509 | 509 | --- |
| ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM) | 25,516 | 18,116 | -7,400 |
| F-111 SELF PROTECTION SYSTEMS | --- | --- | --- |
| TR-1 SQUADRON | 54,764 | 54,764 | --- |
| FOLLOW-ON TACTICAL RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEM | 47,248 | 46,478 | -770 |
| AF TENCAP | 346 | 346 | --- |
| TACIT RAINBOW | 9,759 | 36,759 | +27,000 |
| OVERSEAS AIR WEAPON CONTROL SYSTEM | 2,311 | 2,311 | --- |
| TACTICAL AIR CONTROL SYSTEMS | 17,075 | 15,075 | -2,000 |
| AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS) | 133,810 | 118,810 | -15,000 |
| ADVANCED COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS | 6,385 | 6,385 | --- |
| TACTICAL AIR INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM ACTIVITIES | 484 | 484 | --- |
| SEEK EAGLE | 14,549 | 14,549 | --- |
| OMEGA | --- | -25,000 | -25,000 |
| MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS | 18,146 | 8,146 | -10,000 |
| JOINT TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM (TRI-TAC) | 4,833 | 4,833 | --- |
| ELECTRONIC COMBAT SUPPORT | 2,770 | 2,070 | -700 |
| SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS TERMINALS | 6,071 | 6,071 | --- |
| NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM (NAS) PLAN | 35,000 | 16,000 | -19,000 |
| CONSTANT SOURCE | 6,714 | 6,714 | --- |
| ELECTRONIC COMBAT INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT | 1,841 | 1,841 | --- |
| MAC COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM | 11,626 | 11,626 | --- |
| A-7 SQUADRONS (ANG) | --- | --- | --- |
| FORCE ENHANCEMENTS-ACTIVE | --- | --- | --- |
| C-130J | --- | 10,000 | +10,000 |
| COPPER HELIX | --- | --- | --- |
| CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 750,901 | 833,901 | +83,000 |
| TOTAL, TACTICAL PROGRAMS | 3,777,193 | 3,323,412 | -453,781 |
| INTELLIGENCE & COMMUNICATIONS |  |  |  |
| DEFENSE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM | 16,484 | 16,484 | --- |
| LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS (DCS) | 3,570 | 3,570 | --- |
| ELECTROMAGNETIC COMPATIBILITY ANALYSIS CENTER (ECAC) | 9,637 | 9,637 | --- |
| TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, AND LANDING SYSTEM (TRACALS | 16,557 | 16,557 | --- |
| NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT) | 12,923 | 12,923 | --- |
| NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYS (SPACE & CONT. SGMT) | 48,871 | 48,871 | --- |
| CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 2,157,058 | 2,157,058 | --- |
| TOTAL, INTELLIGENCE & COMMUNICATIONS | 2,265,100 | 2,265,100 | --- |
| DEFENSEWIDE MISSION SUPPORT |  |  |  |
| SPACE TEST PROGRAM | 51,524 | 51,524 | --- |
| SATELLITE SYSTEMS SURVIVABILITY | 10,558 | 10,558 | --- |
| ADVANCED AERIAL TARGET DEVELOPMENT | 16,209 | 11,209 | -5,000 |
| TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 41,220 | 39,220 | -2,000 |
| MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING DEVELOPMENT | 3,494 | 2,494 | -1,000 |
| ADVANCED LAUNCH SYSTEM | 60,314 | 25,000 | -35,314 |
| R&M MATURATION/TECHNOLOGY INSERTION | 19,532 | 17,532 | -2,000 |
| WEATHER SYSTEMS - ENG DEV | 5,361 | 4,775 | -586 |
| RANGE IMPROVEMENT | 100,928 | 78,828 | -22,100 |
| ELECTROMAGNETIC RADIATION TEST FACILITIES | 4,788 | 4,788 | --- |
| IMPROVED CAPABILITY FOR DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVALUATION | 45,720 | 37,720 | -8,000 |
| PROJECT AIR FORCE | 24,611 | 21,571 | -3,040 |
| RANCH HAND II EPIDEMIOLOGY STUDY | 1,524 | 1,524 | --- |
| NAVIGATION/RADAR/SLED TRACK TEST SUPPORT | 27,223 | 23,032 | -4,191 |
| INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION | 20,884 | 10,000 | -10,884 |
| TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT | 318,639 | 294,352 | -24,287 |
| AIR FORCE DEVELOPMENT TEST CENTER | --- | --- | --- |
| DEVELOPMENT PLANNING | 9,138 | 9,138 | --- |
| DYCOMS | 3,369 | 2,369 | -1,000 |
| RDT&E AIRCRAFT SUPPORT | 61,793 | 54,249 | -7,544 |
| RPMA/BASE OPERATIONS - RDT&E | --- | 143,266 | +143,266 |
| REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE - RDT&E | 92,383 | --- | -92,383 |

[In thousands of dollars]

|  | Budget estimate | Committee recom-mendation | Senate compared with budget estimate |
|---|---|---|---|
| BASE OPERATIONS - RDT&E | 61,722 | --- | -61,722 |
| SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK | 127,454 | 127,454 | --- |
| SPACE BOOSTERS/MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLES | 234,297 | 191,807 | -42,490 |
| CONSOLIDATED SPACE OPERATIONS CENTER | 24,323 | 22,323 | -2,000 |
| DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SATELLITE PROGRAM (DMSP) | 49,666 | 49,666 | --- |
| SPACE SHUTTLE OPERATIONS | 19,059 | 19,059 | --- |
| INVENTORY CONTROL POINT OPERATIONS | 4,881 | 4,881 | --- |
| DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF) | 2,740 | 2,740 | --- |
| INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS | 72,133 | --- | -72,133 |
| PRODUCTIVITY, RELIABILITY, AVAILABILITY, MAINTAIN | 20,187 | 20,187 | --- |
| CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM | 4,478 | 4,478 | --- |
| INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES | 4,011 | 3,288 | -723 |
| RANGE SECURITY | --- | --- | --- |
| AEROSPACE CORPORATION/FFRDC | --- | -53,980 | -53,980 |
| MITRE - C(3)I/FFRDC | --- | -55,560 | -55,560 |
| LINCOLN LABORATORY/FFRDC | --- | -54,590 | -54,590 |
| TOTAL, DEFENSEWIDE MISSION SUPPORT | 1,544,163 | 1,124,902 | -419,261 |
| R&D SUPPORT/CIVILIAN WORK YEAR GROWTH | --- | --- | --- |
| REDUCTION FOR ROBOTICS | --- | --- | --- |
| ENGINEERING SERVICES CONTRACTS | --- | --- | --- |
| GENEAL INCREASE | --- | --- | --- |
| TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL AF | 13,276,300 | 11,575,574 | -1,700,726 |
| TRANSFER FROM OTHER ACCOUNTS | --- | (137,000) | (+137,000) |

## RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE AGENCIES

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $8,113,049,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 9,249,300,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 8,563,407,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $8,563,407,000 for research, development, test and evaluation programs of the Defense Agencies, a reduction of $685,893,000 to the budget request for fiscal year 1991.

SUMMARY TABLE

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget estimate | Committee recommendation | Change from budget |
|---|---|---|---|
| Technology base | 1,017,386 | 1,072,794 | +55,408 |
| Advanced technology development | 5,250,856 | 4,465,894 | −784,962 |
| Strategic programs | 499,939 | 393,378 | −106,561 |
| Tactical programs | 497,414 | 461,876 | −35,538 |
| Intelligence and communications | 1,723,262 | 1,723,262 | |
| Defensewide mission support | 260,443 | 446,203 | +185,760 |

The budget activities and programs funded under this appropriation are discussed below.

### OTHER ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommends the following adjustments—already approved by the Senate—to the budget request:

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget estimate | Committee recommendation | Compared with budget estimate |
|---|---|---|---|
| United States-Japan management training | | 10,000 | +10,000 |
| Materials and electronics technology | 43,096 | 69,096 | +26,000 |
| Joint service education and training systems development | 9,689 | 5,000 | −4,689 |
| Joint Standoff Weapons Program | 55,448 | 25,048 | −30,400 |

### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENTS

The fiscal year 1991 budget request included many programs which contained funds associated with management support and RDT&E overhead functions. In expectation of the significant contraction of the defense research and development infrastructure due to likely budget constraints, the Committee recommends funding these program elements at the fiscal year 1990 level. The Committee recommends the following adjustments:

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget estimate | Committee recommendation | Compared with budget estimate |
|---|---|---|---|
| WWMCCS ADP modernization | 55,115 | 47,474 | −7,641 |
| Defense Technical Information Center | 26,241 | 23,308 | −2,933 |
| General support for policy | 5,713 | 3,648 | −2,065 |
| Tech support to USD(A)—critical tech | 3,744 | 2,998 | −746 |
| General support for P&L | 3,281 | 2,698 | −583 |
| Critical technology analysis | 4,611 | 3,019 | −1,592 |

## ADDITIONAL MAJOR PROGRAM ADJUSTMENTS AND SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS

*Tactical technology.*—The Committee recommends $104,035,000 for this program element which funds several major projects by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency [DARPA] to develop advanced technologies for incorporation into future tactical systems. Research areas include technologies in naval warfare, armored warfare, target acquisition, and aeronautics. The recommendation represents a reduction of $17,500,000 to the budget request.

The recommendation deletes the following funds: (*a*) $8,500,000 to develop advanced technology concepts for Special Operations Forces [SOF] sensor systems; (*b*) $6,500,000 for a special operations subproject (in the naval warfare technology project) actually directed toward counter-drug efforts; and (*c*) $2,500,000 for a classified subproject in the target acquisition and weapons technology project.

The SOF sensor systems concept work is a poorly justified new start. The funds also are incorrectly budgeted in DARPA and should have been included in major force program 11, where Special Operations Forces funding has been consolidated. The funds for the special operations antidrugs activity have been transferred to the "Drug interdiction, defense" title in the Committee's bill. The funds are earmarked in the report language for that account for this purpose.

The classified subproject eliminated by the Committee duplicates several programs already underway elsewhere in the defense budget. This poorly justified effort is listed as the second item under the fiscal year 1991 planned program entry for this project in the congressional descriptive summary.

*Integrated command and control technology—high-definition television/display technologies; strategic technology; infrared focal plane array.*—The Committee recommends $67,053,000, an increase of $29,500,000 to the budget request for the integrated command and control technology program in DARPA. The recommendation adds and consolidates funds for research and development of high-definition television/display technologies in this program element to emphasize the importance of this work to national security and economic competitiveness and to increase congressional oversight of these efforts.

The amount provided for these technologies in fiscal year 1991 is $30,000,000—the same amount as appropriated in fiscal year 1990.

This total includes $18,000,000 added to the budget request and $12,000,000 already in the budget request for high-definition display technologies. This latter amount consists of: (*a*) $9,500,000 transferred from the strategic technology program element; (*b*) $2,000,000 transferred from the infrared focal plane array program element; and (*c*) $500,000 already contained in this program element.

To reflect the transfers, the Committee recommends $115,249,000 for the strategic technology program and $18,676,000 for the infrared focal plane array program.

*Defense Nuclear Agency [DNA].*—DNA is the defense agency responsible for much of the Pentagon's generic nuclear weapons research and testing activities. The Committee recommends $326,849,000, a reduction of $28,217,000 to the budget request. The recommended reduction denies a requested, excessive rate of real growth, and maintains DNA's budget at the fiscal year 1990 level in recognition of overall budget constraints and the expected contraction of the defense RDT&E infrastructure.

*Precompetitive technology development.*—The Committee recommends bill language earmarking up to $50,000,000 in excess, standing budget authority in the national defense stockpile transaction fund for new cooperative ventures between DARPA and eligible entities. The full Senate already approved this new program at the $100,000,000 level, but overall budget limits have prompted the Committee to recommend half this amount. The Committee believes the funds provided are more than adequate, under constrained fiscal conditions, for the first year of such a new effort.

The new cooperative arrangements sponsored by this program would be directed at developing technologies critical to the national defense and the civilian economy. The recommendation does not add to the total amount appropriated in the fiscal year 1991 act because standing statutory authority exists for the stockpile transaction fund.

The Committee notes that the Department of Defense critical technologies plan identified integrated optics as one of 22 technologies critical to national defense. The Committee recognizes that the precompetitive technology development initiative would enhance progress already made by DARPA in promoting optoelectronics technology. The Committee expects DARPA to build on its existing optoelectronics program in the implementation of the precompetitive technology development initiative.

Of the funds provided for development of industrial manufacturing capability in technologies critical to the future of our Nation's defense, the Committee directs the Secretary of Defense to give high priority to providing $10,000,000 for construction of a laboratory for university research and accessible by a number of companies seeking to develop or expand manufacturing ability in advanced materials.

The Committee directs that the requirements for DARPA cooperative ventures imposed in its report, and in the conference report, for the Fiscal Year 1990 Defense Appropriations Act also apply to the use of the total recommended funding.

*In-house laboratory independent research.*—This program element funds discretionary research activities at the Uniformed Services

University of the Health Sciences. The Committee recommends $2,467,000, an increase of $125,000 to the budget request. The increase provides funds for the second year of a research effort to investigate the health and technical performance of pilots of high-performance military aircraft. The Committee has received a laudatory independent assessment of the first year of the study and directs that the Defense Department budget for continuation of the work in fiscal year 1992, and beyond, if results in the second year support further extension.

*Strategic defense initiative [SDI].*—This program to develop defenses against strategic and tactical ballistic missiles remains the Defense Department's largest RDT&E program. The Committee recommends $3,573,000,000, a reduction of $887,000,000 as approved by the full Senate, and an amount equal to the fiscal year 1990 funding level for SDI. As further approved by the Senate, the recommendation denies the $265,000,000 sought to begin full-scale development of the boost surveillance and tracking system [BSTS] as part of the phase I strategic defense system.

In addition, bill language is recommended which transfers $137,000,000 included in the SDI budget for advanced development of BSTS to the Air Force. As approved by the full Senate, the transferred funds support continuation of these BSTS activities and are to be combined with $15,000,000 added to the Air Force budget for conduct of a competition for a follow-on capability to the Defense Support Program early warning system.

As already approved by the full Senate, the Committee adopted bill language in a general provision (section 8098) which specifies certain allocations and limitations on the use of funds for the SDI program.

The Committee also understands that the Strategic Defense Initiative Organization [SDIO] proposed using fiscal year 1990 funds to plan, design, and undertake the construction of a liquid fuel missile launch complex at Wake Island in the Pacific Ocean. This proposal is based on the schedule anticipated by SDIO for development and flight tests of the brilliant pebbles space-based interceptor and for conduct of the liquid plume experiments [LPX] using the *Starlab* space shuttle flight. The Committee notes that the current schedules for brilliant pebbles development and space shuttle flights are uncertain. Accordingly, the Committee directs that no funds may be obligated or expended to plan or implement the proposed liquid fuel missile launch complex construction on Wake Island until 30 days after Congress receives: (*a*) an updated budget and schedule for brilliant pebbles development and LPX flights, based on the final outcome of the fiscal year 1991 appropriations process and including the most current space shuttle *Starlab* flight schedule; and (*b*) final versions of all the new and updated environmental-related documentation required for the construction and flight tests.

The Committee also is concerned about the increased threat posed by surface-to-surface ballistic missiles, some with chemical warheads, in the Middle East and Persian Gulf regions. The SDI joint program between the United States and Israel to develop the Arrow theater ballistic missile defense system can contribute to advancing the technologies to defeat this threat. The first phase of the Arrow program is finishing and the Defense Department and

Israeli Ministry of Defense are discussing prospects for a follow-on effort. The Committee directs the Secretary of Defense to proceed without delay to negotiate, on an equitable basis, a memorandum of agreement to continue, as necessary, the Arrow program.

To support this continuation, the Committee directs that $42,000,000 of the funds for SDI's theater missile defense project may only be used for additional joint efforts to develop the Arrow system. Bill language is recommended to accomplish this direction.

*Joint DOD-DOE munitions technology development.*—The Committee recommends $20,000,000, an increase of $11,478,000 to the budget request for this joint program between the Departments of Defense and Energy to develop advanced munitions. The added funds maintain the fiscal year 1990 level of effort. This program capitalizes on the nuclear weapons design expertise of the three Energy Department national weapons laboratories. Such techniques are applied to design more effective conventional munitions and weapons technologies.

*Experimental evaluation of major innovative technologies [EEMIT].*—The Committee recommends $158,357,000, a reduction of $21,040,000 to the budget request for this program element which funds several major projects at the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency. The Committee reduction eliminates $14,000,000 available due to the cancellation of the hypersonic weapons technology project, and $7,040,000 for two new start subprojects in the guidance technology project.

The two new starts—the differential global positioning system and terminal sensors subprojects—are unjustified in view of other advanced guidance and precision targeting efforts underway in the Defense Department. The Committee directs that the $4,000,000 in remaining hypersonic weapons technology funds be used to finish certain tests and data collection to bring that project to a productive end.

*Prototyping of advanced technology and innovative concepts.*—This DARPA program element funds several projects attempting to mature advanced technologies and bring them together in prototype developmental systems to demonstrate their military utility. The Committee recommends $57,742,000, a reduction of $6,500,000 to the budget request.

The recommendation eliminates: (*a*) $5,000,000 for the now-canceled remote surveillance system in the unmanned undersea vehicle project; (*b*) $1,000,000 in the pilot's associate project for a premature study on applying these still-evolving technologies to Special Operations Forces aircraft; and (*c*) $500,000 for expected contract savings on one of the phase II contracts for the baseline pilot's associate effort.

*Balanced technology initiative [BTI].*—The Committee recommends $162,687,000, a reduction of $46,500,000 to the budget request for this program to develop technologies to enhance U.S. conventional war-fighting capabilities. BTI concentrates on advanced technologies, such as new warhead and gun technologies, targeting sensors, and precision-guided weapons.

This program has suffered from, among other problems, a lack of firm priorities. The result was a financially overextended program with too many unaffordable projects, several of which were of insufficient priority to merit separate service funding. The Office of the Secretary of Defense [OSD] has made significant progress in improving program management. However, some problems persist. The Committee has tried to address them in the specific actions embodied in its recommendation.

The Committee recommendation defers $35,500,000 for a classified project discussed in the classified annex. This project has been improperly budgeted in BTI, and should be funded elsewhere in the defense budget, where it can compete against other program priorities in the particular mission area affected. A very expensive program, it also is not fully funded in the fiscal years 1992–97 defense program, is of questionable cost effectiveness, and lacks a formal requirement and operational and organizational plan for its employment.

Also deferred is $7,000,000 of the $11,200,000 requested for major contract awards for the battalion targeting system [BTS] in fiscal year 1991. The deferral permits Congress to address this project's military utility and affordability during the next budget review. It also prevents a premature commitment to a complex technology integration endeavor expected to cost more than $90,000,000.

The Committee denies the $4,000,000 sought for a new start emitter strike system. This project could cost almost $80,000,000 and appears to duplicate the ongoing Tacit Rainbow program in the Air Force and Army.

The Committee is concerned that the projects it is denying represent a continuation of past problems with BTI, especially in the area of affordability. The current BTI program, while reduced and more focused, still is estimated to cost about $1,100,000,000 in the next 4 years. The availability of this amount is highly uncertain in the future defense budget environment.

*Air defense initiative [ADI].*—This program funds development of advanced air defense and antisubmarine warfare technologies to defend the continental United States from the Soviet cruise missile and bomber threat. Requirements for the program remain uncertain, and its outyear program plans probably are unaffordable in the likely budget environment.

In view of these continuing problems, the Committee recommends $148,000,000, a reduction of $98,920,000 to the budget request. The recommendation maintains ADI funding at the fiscal year 1990 level. Within the amount provided, the Committee directs that $35,000,000 is available only for a mountain-top radar research and demonstration facility.

*Nonacoustic antisubmarine warfare [ASW].*—The Committee recommends an increase of $30,000,000 to the budget request in this program element to fund a coordinated, focused effort managed by OSD to explore critical nonacoustic ASW technologies. Program participants include the Navy, the defense agencies, Energy Department national laboratories, other Federal organizations, and certain NATO allies. Last year, Congress denied funds for separate Navy efforts in this area in favor of this joint approach. The Committee's recommendation provides funds to support this consolidated program at its current level.

OSD's report to Congress on the establishment of the joint program indicates that a useful consolidated effort has been created.

The $30,000,000 allocated to OSD for fiscal year 1991 includes $8,884,000 transferred from the Navy and $21,116,000 added to the budget request. In the "Navy RDT&E" account, the Committee added $8,435,000 to the SSBN Security Technology Program and approved $14,000,000 for the Navy's separate, generic nonacoustic ASW program to enhance activities in this important warfare area.

As with the funds provided in the Navy account, the Committee directs that none of the funds in the joint program may be obligated or expended until a joint certification is received from OSD and the Navy that their efforts are complementary and not duplicative. The Committee further directs that $11,700,000 of the funds provided to OSD are available only for project 111, a high-priority classified effort.

*Joint remotely piloted vehicle program.*—The Committee recommends $67,099,000, a reduction of $15,000,000 to the budget request, for this program to develop unmanned aerial vehicles [UAV] and associated payloads and ground control stations. The recommendation eliminates funds not expected to be spent in fiscal year 1991 due to slow execution and expenditure of fiscal year 1990 funds. Of the funds provided, the Committee directs that $1,300,000 shall be available only for the second year of a project to develop, fabricate, and prove an integrated UAV automatic recovery simulator, simulation model, and portable recovery simulation system.

Finally, the Committee has been informed about the status of the tests to examine candidates for the close-range UAV system. Those competitors included systems using vertical takeoff and landing technology. The Committee believes the Defense Department should take the requisite steps to ensure cost-effective interoperability and commonality among the close-, short-, and mid-range UAV systems managed by the joint program.

*Force enhancements—Active; Assistant Secretary of Defense, special operations/low-intensity conflict [ASD, SO/LIC].*—The Committee recommends $160,230,000, a reduction to the budget request of $22,138,000 for the force enhancements—active program element. This program element develops advanced technologies to improve the capabilities of U.S. Special Operations Forces in all the armed services. The Committee also approves an increase of $2,000,000 to the budget request for a new program element to give the Assistant Secretary of Defense[SO/LIC] a level of analytical support similar to that provided other Assistant Secretaries of Defense.

The Committee's recommendation for the force enhancements—active program element consists of several adjustments to the budget request.

As a result of the combat experience gained in Operation Just Cause in Panama, the Committee adds $3,930,000 to improve existing ammunition used by Special Operations Forces AC–130 gunships. The specific improvements are: (*a*) 105 mm hard target programmable fuze penetrator; (*b*) 105 mm/40 mm blast reducer; (*c*) 25 mm fuze improvement; (*d*) 25 mm armor piercing long-range penetrator; and (*e*) Hellfire missile demonstration;

The Committee defers $7,500,000 from the joint advanced special operations radio system [JASORS] project. This project has been completely restructured from that upon which the budget request was based. Initial major program milestones have slipped from 9 to

24 months. The recommendation prevents a premature acceleration of this complex integration effort until Congress can evaluate the program restructure and its technical risk and affordability. JASORS is expected to cost at least $500,000,000 and contains major high-risk technology elements.

OSD identified $7,000,000 in the Combat Talon II integrated defensive system project, and $1,000,000 in the aircrew training system project, as excess to firm program requirements in fiscal year 1991. The Committee deletes these funds.

The Committee deletes $3,999,000 based on the availability of an equal amount of fiscal year 1990 resources in a classified project under the direction of Navy Program Manager, Ships, 300. These funds are available to fund fiscal year 1991 requirements, since they were to be reprogrammed into the EX 8 mod 1 Seal delivery vehicle [SDV] project for an unjustified, marginal acceleration of that project's schedule. The Committee denies the proposed acceleration.

The interactive defensive avionics system project contained $2,588,000 for a study effort the Air Force has yet to decide whether to pursue, and $800,000 identified as excess to known project requirements. The Committee eliminates these funds.

The Committee also eliminates $200,000 from the M–13 rapid available (foreign) craft project to terminate this effort as an unrealistic, unnecessary study exercise. The concept of trying to assess the availability and specific technical characteristics of the thousands of types of ships and craft worldwide—to establish interface standards between them and SOF equipment—defies credibility.

Finally, the Committee recommends deferral of $2,981,000 for what is essentially a new start project to develop a family of mobile radio and television stations, known as the mobile psychological operations transmitter [M–POTS]. The Committee doubts the priority for M–POTS for special operations psychological warfare units, since justification documents identify it as a system which primarily supports theater conventional forces. If theater Commanders-in-Chief believe a mobile radio, color video, and mobile news gathering capability are essential for successful war fighting, the Committee suggests the funds for such efforts compete for scarce resources with the tanks, aircraft, ships, ordnance, and spares in the rest of the defense budget.

Furthermore, the Committee notes that mobile television production capabilities and transportable radio transmitters already are being produced for the SOF units as interim capabilities. These systems are the AN/MSQ-85B and AN/TSQ-171 video systems and the TAMT–50, a 50,000-watt radio transmitter. The Committee suggests that reasonable operational experience be gained with these systems before a more complex and ambitious system is developed.

The Committee approves the full budget request of $16,000,000 associated with evaluating and modifying the 3GST9 submersible as the advanced Seal delivery system [ASDS]. This amount contains funds for the operational evaluation of the submersible, including vehicle certification, engineering evaluation, and at-sea tests. The Committee has strongly supported evaluation of the 3GST9 as a potential way to avoid a more costly program to develop a completely new ASDS.

The Committee understands two key dates will occur in fiscal year 1991 (in December 1990 and May 1991) with respect to this evaluation and OSD's decisions whether the 3GST9, with limited modifications, can meet Navy SOF needs. Accordingly, the Committee directs that only $8,679,000 of the funds provided may be obligated until 30 days after ASD [SO/LIC] reports in detail on these decisions. These funds are available only for those activities directly associated with the conduct and assessment of this opeational evaluation. The Committee directs that the 3GST9/ASDS effort continue to be conducted in accordance with the management and reporting requirements established in the conference report on the Fiscal Year 1990 Defense Appropriations Act.

The Committee further directs that no funds available to the Defense Department during fiscal year 1991 may be used for any activities associated with developing a new ASDS, not an ASDS representing a modification of the 3GST9, without prior Committee approval.

*Integrated diagnostics.*—Integrated diagnostics is a concept for designing maintenance capability for weapon systems as a complete package, instead of as individual, related components, such as failure sensors and technical manuals. There are now several service projects developing integrated diagnostic maintenance capabilities for specific systems. The Committee denies the $7,520,000 requested for this program element in the defense agencies funding because the individual services should be, and are, budgeting for such logistics research and development efforts.

*NATO research and development [R&D].*—The Committee recommends the full budget request of $95,781,000 for this program to fund cooperative defense RDT&E programs between the United States and NATO, and major non-NATO allies. The Committee wants to reinforce its expectation that the executive branch will obey the law—as stated in section 205 of the Fiscal Year 1990 Dire Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act—regarding prior submittal to Congress of the text of new, or amended, memoranda of agreement/understanding for this program. The Committee hopes that executive branch compliance will obviate the need for further statutory direction.

The Committee further directs that the Defense Department may not use the $14,000,000 included in the NATO R&D program, or any other funds, for United States participation in a joint development program with the United Kingdom, France, and the Federal Republic of Germany for a new, 140 mm tank gun. Development of a 140 mm tank gun contradicts the Committee's recommendation in the "Army RDT&E" account to emphasize improved ammunition and gun technologies to enhance the lethality of the current 120 mm tank fleet. In addition, the Senate already has approved a statutory recommendation prohibiting full-scale development of a 140 mm tank gun.

Last year $9,000,000 was transferred from the Air Force joint tactical information distribution systems [JTIDS] program to the NATO research and development program for the purpose of supporting the multifunctional information distribution system [MIDS]. Since that time, the Air Force has withdrawn from the program and the Navy has been designated the lead service. The

Committee expects that the Navy will begin budgeting for this program in fiscal year 1992.

The Committee understands that an additional $5,000,000 in fiscal year 1991 funds are needed to continue MIDS development. Accordingly, the Committee directs that $5,000,000 of the new funds provided to the NATO R&D program element for fiscal year 1991 is available only for the MIDS project.

Finally, the Committee is aware of the proposal to expand United States-Japan cooperation on technological research and development, and to fund this expansion with $10,000,000 in fiscal year 1991. Since the NATO R&D program also funds joint projects with certain major non-NATO allies—which already include Japan—the Committee directs that this program element should support any expanded United States-Japan technological cooperation. The Committee believes that the amount recommended for this program element in fiscal year 1991 is sufficient to accommodate any expanded United States-Japan technology cooperation.

*Industrial preparedness; manufacturing technology [MANTECH].*—As already approved by the full Senate, the Committee recommends transferring the $10,912,000 requested by the Defense Logistics Agency for manufacturing technology development to a new consolidated program element under the auspices of OSD. Similar recommendations are made with respect to the armed services manufacturing technology program elements.

The Committee recommends $170,000,000, an increase of $18,420,000, to the combined budget request for all these transferred program elements. The transfer is intended to increase institutional support for defense manufacturing technology programs and to insure better coordination and integration of these programs. The programs are intended to develop improved processes for producing more efficiently, and less expensively, the components, subsystems, and systems for military platforms.

Within the funds provided for this joint program, the Committee directs the following mandatory allocations: (*a*) the budget request is available only for continuing an effort to enhance U.S. manufacturing base capabilities to produce precision optics for sights and visual equipment, as part of the weapons and tracked combat vehicles project transferred from the Army; (*b*) $2,900,000 is available only to continue funding a Center of Excellence for Advanced Flexible Manufacturing Systems, funded through the National Center for Manufacturing Sciences, as part of the industrial preparedness program transferred from the Air Force; (*c*) $5,000,000 is available only for a Center of Excellence in Composites Manufacturing Technology, as transferred from the Navy's industrial preparedness program; (*d*) $3,000,000 is available only for a project to transfer to several Navy shipyards the electroslag welding and surfacing technology initiated at the Oregon Graduate Institute in conjunction with Puget Sound Naval Shipyard; and (*e*) $2,500,000 is available only for ongoing efforts to develop manufacturing technologies for the fabrication of propulsors for submarines and design and manufacturing of lightweight structures for ships and repair of valves and catapult launch systems for aircraft carriers, as transferred from the Navy.

*National Defense Research Institute [NDRI]; Institute for Defense Analyses [IDA]; Consolidated DOD software initiative—Software Engineering Institute [SEI]; Logistics Management Institute [LMI].*—As part of its initiative to eliminate exorbitant growth in funding for defense federally funded research and development centers [FFRDC's], the Committee recommends budget reductions for the defense agencies four FFRDC's. The reductions are the shares each organization should absorb as part of the Committee's overall recommendation to return total defense FFRDC funding to the fiscal year 1987 level, as adjusted for inflation. Fiscal year 1987 was the peak year of defense RDT&E funding during the last decade.

Full justification and direction for implementing this recommendation are contained in the introduction to the RDT&E section of the report. Although for accounting purposes, the recommendation is assessed against defense agencies RDT&E program elements and funding, the Committee intends that the reductions be applied against total fiscal year 1991 funding for each of the FFRDC's. The total funding for each organization includes direct appropriations through RDT&E program elements (in two cases) plus additional Defense Department contract funds.

The recommended funding for each FFRDC is: (*a*) $17,338,000 for the Rand Corp.'s National Defense Research Institute, a reduction of $3,580,000; (NDRI's total fiscal year funding was requested at $29,500,000); (*b*) $86,110,000 for the Institute for Defense Analyses, a reduction of $11,890,000 to the request; (*c*) $19,770,000 for Logistics Management Institute, a reduction of $2,730,000; and (*d*) $31,172,000 for the consolidated DOD software initiative—Software Engineering Institute, a reduction of $3,400,000.

*AIM-9 consolidated program.*—The Committee recommends $30,000,000 in a new defense agencies program element to fund a joint Air Force-Navy program to develop enhancements to the AIM-9 Sidewinder short-range missile. Such a consolidation already has been approved by the full Senate. Recommendations in the Navy and Air Force RDT&E accounts eliminate separate funding for the duplicative, AIM-9 missile upgrade programs each service was requesting for fiscal year 1991.

*Strategic technology; high performance computing.*—The Committee recommends $115,249,000, a net reduction of $92,500,000, to this program element of several projects in the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency. This recommendation reflects: (*a*) the transfer of the $108,000,000 requested for DARPA strategic computing activities to a new high-performance computing program element; (*b*) the transfer of $9,500,000 requested for high-definition display technologies to a consolidated program within the integrated command and control technology program element; and, (*c*) the addition of $25,000,000 for the third year of the DARPA initiative in concurrent engineering [DICE]. DICE is a manufacturing technology effort to combine computer-aided techniques and artificial intelligence to design improved logistics technologies into products from their inception.

The Committee recommends $128,000,000 for the new high-performance computing program element in DARPA. This amount represents an increase of $20,000,000 to the budget request to accelerate research in this critical technology. The separate program element is intended to highlight the importance of DARPA's strategic computing efforts and to improve congressional oversight. DARPA, a national leader in high-performance computing, has been assigned a leading role in the country's high-performance computing initiative.

*Critical Technology Institute.*—As approved by the full Senate, the Committee adds $5,000,000 to the budget for a Critical Technology Institute. The Institute is intended to assist the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy in planning and implementing development of critical technologies related to national security and global economic competitiveness. The Committee expects that funds for continuing the Critical Technology Institute in fiscal year 1992 and later years will be budgeted for outside the Defense Department.

*Strategic environmental research program [SERP].*—As approved by the full Senate, the Committee recommends adding $200,000,000 to the budget request for a strategic environmental research program to increase the Defense Department's contributions to countering major environmental threats facing the Nation and the global environment.

The Committee supports the goals and general direction of this initiative, but believes that it fails to address certain concerns central to a balanced environmental protection and restoration effort. These concerns include technical support for species conservation activities on Defense Department lands and sufficient emphasis on the development of renewable energy resources.

Consistent with the priorities described in the report accompanying the Fiscal Year 1991 Defense Authorization Act establishing the Strategic Environmental Research Program, the Committee also believes that the issue of global environmental change is important to the mission of the SERP. To address this component of the initiative, the Committee directs that $25,000,000 of the funds appropriated for this initiative shall be available only for the establishment of an Arctic region supercomputing center to support research by the Department of Defense and other Federal agencies and the academic community.

The acquisition of one supercomputer, with ownership to be retained by the Department of Defense, will commence this effort. The new supercomputing center should be established at an institution engaged in Department of Defense research located within the Arctic region. The supercomputing capabilities should be available to all qualified Federal and academic research activities engaged in environmental studies.

The supercomputing center should also be available to support other Department of Defense research initiatives, including the possible exploitation of the auroral ionospheric electrojet for nonpolluting power generation.

The Committee expects the Joint Strategic Environmental Research Program Council to report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations no later than March 15, 1991, on the specific timetable and implementation plan to establish the Arctic region supercomputing center. This report should address the acquisition of the supercomputer and the mission and utilization of the center by Federal and non-Federal research activities.

*National defense science and engineering graduate fellowships.*—The Committee recommends a general provision providing $11,500,000 for fiscal year 1991 to fund the national defense science and engineering graduate fellowship program administered by OSD. The provision modifies section 9096 of the Fiscal Year 1990 Defense Appropriations Act. The new statutory provision provides the funds for this initiative from amounts available for the defense research sciences program throughout the Defense Department.

This is the third year that the Committee has recommended such a program, which originally was established by the Fiscal Year 1989 Defense Appropriations Act. As it did last year, the Committee directs that the fiscal year 1991 appropriation be subject to the terms and conditions expressed in the conference report statement of managers for the fiscal year 1989 act, with the exception that all the funds are to be provided from the defense research sciences program.

*Joint standoff weapons master plan.*—At the Committee's initiative 3 years ago, the Defense Department was required to submit to Congress an annual master plan reconciling and justifying the many standoff weapons programs and associated component development efforts within the Pentagon budget. In addition, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101-189) has codified into permanent law the requirement for an annual submission of the master plan no later than March 31 of each year.

The Committee believes this document is useful for its annual budget considerations, and that the internal effort to produce the plan has imposed some added rigor on the Department's requirements-setting process.

Accordingly, the Defense Department is expected to comply fully with the law and to update the standoff weapons master plan and submit a revised version no later than March 31, 1991.

*Spinal cord injury medical/research facility.*—The Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1990, allocated in law $18,000,000 in the "Defense agencies RDT&E" account for a facility to enable collaborative research and training for military medical personnel in trauma care, head, neck, and spinal injury, paralysis, and neurodegenerative diseases. The Committee is disappointed that the Secretary of Defense has refused to use these funds for their stated purpose. Accordingly, the Committee is recommending bill language which requires the obligation of these funds within 90 days after the enactment of the fiscal year 1991 appropriations measure.

*PACE technology.*—The Committee understands that the Department of Defense has evaluated the potential of ceramic engine and powerplant technologies. The Committee endorses these initiatives, and believes that close coordination with the Department of Energy will maximize the investment by the Federal Government in these technologies.

The Committee directs that the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency [DARPA] and the Department of Energy jointly evaluate the PACE engine. DARPA and the Department of Energy shall report their evaluation of the utility of the PACE concept for application in defense systems and civil applications for more efficient and reliable powerplant systems. This report should be provided to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by June 15, 1991.

*Sematech.*—The Committee recommends full funding of the $100,000,000 requested for this Government-industry semiconductor manufacturing technology development consortium. Sematech has established 11 centers of excellence at universities around the country. These centers grant stipends to graduate students and research funds to professors to encourage university participation in developing new semiconductor manufacturing technologies. The Committee understands that these centers have provided a worthwhile link between academia and the semiconductor industry. The Committee thus directs that a report on any Sematech plans for new centers be prepared and presented to the Committees on Appropriations no later than March 31, 1991. If appropriate, Sematech should consider establishing new centers and provide sufficient funds for their creation in its fiscal year 1992 budget request.

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget estimate | Committee recom-mendation | Senate compared with budget estimate |
|---|---|---|---|
| RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL DEF AG | | | |
| TECHNOLOGY BASE | | | |
| DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES | 85,238 | 85,238 | --- |
| IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH | 2,342 | 2,467 | +125 |
| UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES | 98,681 | 98,681 | --- |
| DOD GRADUATE FELLOWSHIP TRAINING | --- | --- | --- |
| ENGINEERING - TRAINING INITIATIVE | --- | --- | --- |
| U.S. JAPAN MANAGEMENT TRAINING | --- | 10,000 | +10,000 |
| HF ACTIVE AURORAL RESEARCH PROGRAM | --- | --- | --- |
| SUPER CONDUCTIVE MAGNETIC ENERGY STORAGE | 15,000 | 15,000 | --- |
| STRATEGIC TECHNOLOGY | 207,749 | 115,249 | -92,500 |
| TACTICAL TECHNOLGY | 121,535 | 104,035 | -17,500 |
| HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING | --- | 128,000 | +128,000 |
| PARTICLE BEAM TECHNOLOGY | 14,500 | 14,500 | --- |
| INTEGRATED COMMAND AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY | 37,553 | 67,053 | +29,500 |
| MATERIALS AND ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY | 43,096 | 69,096 | +26,000 |
| NUCLEAR MONITORING | 36,626 | 36,626 | --- |
| DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY | 355,066 | 326,849 | -28,217 |
| LIGHTER THAN AIR TECHNOLOGY (DARPA) | --- | --- | --- |
| PRE-COMPETITIVE TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | --- | --- | --- |
| TRANSFER FROM OTHER ACCOUNTS 1/ | --- | (50,000) | (+50,000) |
| TOTAL, TECHNOLOGY BASE | 1,017,386 | 1,072,794 | +55,408 |
| TRANSFER FROM OTHER ACCOUNTS | --- | (50,000) | (+50,000) |
| ADVANCE TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | | | |
| STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE (SDI) | 4,195,000 | 3,573,000 | -622,000 |
| THEATER TACTICAL BALLISTIC MISSILE, DEFENSE | --- | --- | --- |
| MINIATURE DIAGNOSTIC PROTON ACCELERATOR RESEARCH | --- | --- | --- |
| JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 8,522 | 20,000 | +11,478 |
| EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION OF MAJOR INNOVATIVE TECH | 179,397 | 158,357 | -21,040 |
| LIGHTSAT | --- | --- | --- |
| RELOCATABLE TARGET DETECTION TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM | 22,702 | 22,702 | --- |
| ADVANCED SUBMARINE TECHNOLOGY | --- | --- | --- |
| COMBAT VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY | --- | --- | --- |
| SPECIAL TECHNICAL SUPPORT | 11,191 | 11,191 | --- |
| MICROWAVE/MILLIMETER WAVE MONOLITHIC INTEGRATED CIRCUI | 86,657 | 86,657 | --- |
| PROTOTYPING OF ADVANCED TECH & INNOVATIVE CONCEPTS | 64,242 | 57,742 | -6,500 |
| COMPUTER AIDED LOGISTICS SUPPORT | 13,779 | 13,779 | --- |
| MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY | --- | 170,000 | +170,000 |
| BALANCED TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVE | 209,187 | 162,687 | -46,500 |
| COOPERATIVE DOD/VA MEDICAL RESEARCH | --- | --- | --- |
| SEMICONDUCTOR MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY | 100,000 | 100,000 | --- |
| CONSOLIDATED DOD SOFTWARE INITIATIVE | 12,661 | 12,661 | --- |
| CONSOLIDATED DOD SOFTWARE INITIATIVE/SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE-FFRDC | 34,572 | 31,172 | -3,400 |
| COMMAND AND CONTROL RESEARCH | 2,486 | 2,486 | --- |
| INFRARED FOCAL PLANE ARRAY | 20,676 | 18,676 | -2,000 |
| FORCE ENHANCEMENTS-ACTIVE | --- | --- | --- |
| ADVANCED SPECIAL OPERATIONS RESEARCH, DEV AND ACQ | 24,784 | 24,784 | --- |
| ADVANCED SPECIAL OPERATIONS RESEARCH, DEV AND ACQ | --- | --- | --- |
| TOTAL, ADVANCE TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 4,985,856 | 4,465,894 | -519,962 |
| STRATEGIC PROGRAMS | | | |
| VERIFICATION TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION | 76,000 | 76,000 | --- |
| ISLAND SUN SUPPORT | 84,624 | 84,624 | --- |
| ISLAND SUN | --- | --- | --- |
| AIR DEFENSE INITIATIVE | 246,920 | 148,000 | -98,920 |
| PHASE I STRATEGIC DEFENSE SYSTEM (BSTS) | 265,000 | --- | -265,000 |
| NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM-WIDE SUPPORT | 12,088 | 12,088 | --- |
| WWMCCS SYSTEMS ENGINEER | 16,952 | 16,952 | --- |
| MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK | 8,240 | 8,240 | --- |
| WWMCCS ADP MODERNIZATION | 55,115 | 47,474 | -7,641 |
| TOTAL, STRATEGIC PROGRAMS | 764,939 | 393,378 | -371,561 |

1/ TO FUND PRE-COMPETITIVE TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget estimate | Committee recom- mendation | Senate compared with budget estimate |
|---|---|---|---|
| TACTICAL PROGRAMS | | | |
| PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT | 34,022 | 34,022 | --- |
| JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM | 22,000 | 22,000 | --- |
| NON-ACOUSTIC ASW | --- | 30,000 | +30,000 |
| JOINT STANDOFF WEAPONS PROGRAM | 55,448 | 25,048 | -30,400 |
| JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS) | 66,232 | 66,232 | --- |
| CINC C2 INITIATIVES | 1,974 | 1,974 | --- |
| C3 INTEROPERABILITY (JOINT TACTICAL C3 AGENCY) | 46,682 | 46,682 | --- |
| MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (JOINT TACTICAL C3 AGENCY) | 6,589 | 6,589 | --- |
| JOINT REMOTELY PILOTED VEHICLES PROGRAM | 82,099 | 67,099 | -15,000 |
| LOGISTICS/WEIGHT REDUCTION STUDY | --- | --- | --- |
| GENERAL SUPPORT FOR SO/LIC | --- | 2,000 | +2,000 |
| TECHNICAL SUPPORT WORKING GROUP | --- | --- | --- |
| TORPEDO SOFTWARE VALIDATION | --- | --- | --- |
| FORCE ENHANCEMENTS-ACTIVE | 182,368 | 160,230 | -22,138 |
| TOTAL, TACTICAL PROGRAMS | 497,414 | 461,876 | -35,538 |
| INTELLIGENCE & COMMUNICATIONS | | | |
| LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS (DCS) | 20,516 | 20,516 | --- |
| SUPPORT OF THE NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM | 3,426 | 3,426 | --- |
| DMA MAPPING, CHARTING, & GEODESY PROD SYS IMPROVE | 224,725 | 224,725 | --- |
| AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT PROGRAM | 179,900 | 179,900 | --- |
| DEFENSE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES | 7,375 | 7,375 | --- |
| DEFENSE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES | 45,821 | 45,821 | --- |
| CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 1,241,499 | 1,241,499 | --- |
| TOTAL, INTELLIGENCE & COMMUNICATIONS | 1,723,262 | 1,723,262 | --- |
| DEFENSEWIDE MISSION SUPPORT | | | |
| INTEGRATED DIAGNOSTICS | 7,520 | --- | -7,520 |
| NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT | 95,781 | 95,781 | --- |
| JOINT SERVICE EDUCATION AND TRAINING SYSTEMS DEV | 9,689 | 5,000 | -4,689 |
| JOINT SERVICE EDUCATION AND TRAINING SYSTEMS DEV | --- | --- | --- |
| TECHNICAL SUPPORT TO USD(A) | 17,138 | 17,138 | --- |
| GENERAL SUPPORT FOR PA&E | 2,524 | 2,524 | --- |
| GENERAL SUPPORT FOR POLICY | 5,713 | 3,648 | -2,065 |
| GENERAL SUPPORT FOR NET ASSESSMENT | 3,814 | 3,814 | --- |
| GENERAL SUPPORT FOR FM&P | 1,635 | 1,635 | --- |
| TECHNICAL SUPPORT TO USD(A)--CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY | 3,744 | 2,998 | -746 |
| CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY INSTITUTE | --- | 5,000 | +5,000 |
| RAND NATIONAL DEFENSE RESEARCH INSTITUTE | 20,918 | 17,338 | -3,580 |
| BLACK LIGHT | 6,000 | 6,000 | --- |
| GENERAL SUPPORT TO C3I | 2,269 | 2,269 | --- |
| FOREIGN MATERIAL ACQUISITION AND EXPLOITATION | 11,095 | 11,095 | --- |
| GENERAL SUPPORT FOR P&L | 3,281 | 2,698 | -583 |
| CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS | 4,611 | 3,019 | -1,592 |
| CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS | --- | --- | --- |
| DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER | 26,241 | 23,308 | -2,933 |
| INFORMATION ANALYSIS CENTERS | 5,539 | 5,539 | --- |
| R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING AND EVAL | 1,800 | 1,800 | --- |
| R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING AND EVAL | --- | --- | --- |
| MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT) | 17,778 | 17,778 | --- |
| INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS | 10,912 | --- | -10,912 |
| JOINT WARGAMMING SIMULATION MGMT OFFICE | --- | --- | --- |
| AIM-9 CONSOLIDATED PROGRAM | --- | 30,000 | +30,000 |
| STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM | --- | 200,000 | +200,000 |
| SECURITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM | --- | --- | --- |
| TECHNOLOGY SECURITY FUNCTIONS | 2,441 | 2,441 | --- |
| RESEARCH PROJECTS | --- | --- | --- |
| ENVIRONMENTAL CENTER | --- | --- | --- |
| INSTITUTE FOR DEFENSE ANALYSES/FFRDC | --- | -11,890 | -11,890 |
| LOGISTICS MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE/FFRDC | --- | -2,730 | -2,730 |
| TOTAL, DEFENSEWIDE MISSION SUPPORT | 260,443 | 446,203 | +185,760 |

[In thousands of dollars]

|  | Budget estimate | Committee recommendation | Senate compared with budget estimate |
|---|---|---|---|
| DARPA MANAGEMENT RESERVE | --- | --- | --- |
| R&D SUPPORT/CIVILIAN WORK YEAR GROWTH | --- | --- | --- |
| LASER VERIFICATION | --- | --- | --- |
| EXCIMER LASER TECHNOLOGY | --- | --- | --- |
| HOT WEATHER TESTING (DESERT SHIELD) | --- | --- | --- |
| GENERAL REDUCTION | --- | --- | --- |
| CLASSIFIED PROGRAM | --- | --- | --- |
| TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL DEF AG | 9,249,300 | 8,563,407 | -685,893 |
| TRANSFER FROM OTHER ACCOUNTS | --- | (50,000) | (+50,000) |

## DEVELOPMENTAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $178,221,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 348,100,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 226,679,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $226,679,000 for developmental test and evaluation, defense, a reduction of $121,421,000 to the budget request for fiscal year 1991.

### DIRECTOR OF TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

*Test instrumentation development.*—This program, now renamed the Central Test and Evaluation Investment Program [CTEIP], funds the acquisition of developmental testing equipment for several Defense Department test ranges. The Committee recommends $107,959,000, a reduction of $77,940,000 to the budget request.

CTEIP began in fiscal year 1990 with optimistic projections of outyear funding profiles. At the Committee's initiative, however, Congress imposed a large funding reduction to the fiscal year 1990 budget request and recommended several programmatic changes, including a major restructuring. Despite these recommendations, the program has not been significantly restructured. Program plans still call for approximately $1,700,000,000 in the next 7 years, a level that is unlikely to be available due to future budget limits.

The Committee further is concerned that the program still is unstable. The shifting priorities and fluctuating project funding levels within CTEIP program documents mean that Congress can have no assurance that the projects it approves are those that actually will be implemented.

CTEIP has been presented to Congress as a way for the Department of Defense to fill gaps in developmental test and evaluation capabilities. At this time, the Committee feels that if these shortfalls exist, it is primarily the responsibility of the individual services to correct these deficiencies within their own budgets. The Committee remains concerned that CTEIP functions as an off-line budget source for test and evaluation equipment for the services. OSD and the Director of Test and Evaluation, Defense, should exercise sufficient budgetary and programmatic control over the service priorities to ensure that the service budgets include adequate funds for developmental test and evaluation capabilities. Based on this concern, the Committee was particularly critical of projects proposed for CTEIP that should have been funded by individual services.

The Committee also asked the General Accounting Office [GAO] to examine the CTEIP request. Preliminary GAO information disclosed several projects with only single-service application, others which focused on acquisition, not development, of equipment, and still others which were poorly justified, or of low priority.

Because of these concerns, the Committee recommends a revised approach to CTEIP. The Committee believes that a central organization should lend a measure of coherence and coordination to the diverse test and evaluation programs across the services. The Committee is less persuaded of the necessity of other CTEIP activities. Specifically, the Committee recommends that CTEIP reconsider providing funds for the procurement of test and evaluation equipment, and for projects that benefit only one service.

The Committee concludes at this time that a centrally funded program like CTEIP should be a development and coordination program geared toward multiservice application of any systems developed. The services would then be expected to budget for procurement of equipment developed within this program.

To encourage the restructuring of CTEIP as recommended, the Committee makes the following reductions to the program request: (*a*) $14,220,000 for a stores certification project which should have been funded by the Air Force; (*b*) $7,030,000 for the DOD space test capability project due to uncertain outyear testing requirements and schedule slips; (*c*) $8,980,000 for the smart munitions test suite which should have been budgeted for the Army and also faces possible fiscal year 1991 execution problems; and (*d*) $25,380,000 for mobile object tracking radar procurement which should have been funded by the individual services.

Also deleted are: (*e*) $800,000 for a target control project which is low priority among the services; (*f*) $1,000,000 for an air-defense capability which is low priority because it would simulate a European threat environment; (*g*) $12,600,000 for the air combat environment test and evaluation facility, an upgrade for Navy laboratories which should have been funded in the Navy budget and may be premature due to possible contraction of defense test and laboratory facilities; and (*h*) $19,990,000 for procurement of global positioning system [GPS] range equipment, which should have been funded in service budgets. The Committee also denies $950,000 for a deep water research and development range, $2,140,000 for a portable tracking system, and $7,900,000 for an underwater weapon simulator. These efforts all are Navy-specific projects which should have been funded in that service's budget.

The Committee does direct that, of the funds provided for the Central Test and Evaluation Investment Program, $23,370,000 be used only for the development of GPS range equipment for the three services. These adjustments to the GPS program accord with the Committee direction to make CTEIP a development, rather than a procurement, program.

The Committee also has included in its total budget recommendation for CTEIP the mandatory allocation of some funds for elements of the Capability Improvement Program [CIP], which had been requested in the "Director of Operational Test and Evaluation" [D,OT&E] appropriation account.

The CIP program also purchases testing devices and range instrumentation for the services, but for operational testing purposes. This year, GAO found that the mission of the Director, OT&E, does not include this procurement function. Accordingly, the Committee is recommending a reduction in the "D,OT&E" account in the next report section.

The Committee thinks legitimate operational testing equipment development needs can be met through the CTEIP program element, and understands that the Defense Department is considering such an arrangement under a new name, the Resources Enhancement Program. The Committee, therefore, directs that the following former CIP projects be funded by CTEIP: (*a*) triservice coordination, $10,000,000; (*b*) base resources, $6,850,000; and (*c*) SA–12 expedient, $6,200,000. The base resources project supports the integration of already acquired, operational test assets onto test ranges, and the SA–12 expedient develops a partial surrogate Soviet air defense system.

The Committee expects that for fiscal year 1992 and later years, the Defense Department will budget for operational test and evaluation capabilities development within the CTEIP program. The Committee directs that the same criteria outlined above be used for these projects as for CTEIP activities.

*Foreign comparative testing.*—This program provides funds to evaluate the effectiveness of foreign-developed military systems for possible purchase by the United States. The Committee recommends $22,878,000, a reduction of $19,713,000 to the budget request. The recommendation deletes $12,713,000 identified as excess to firm program requirements and $7,000,000 requested for testing ground-based sensors for the Army's forward area air defense-heavy system. The latter testing is unneeded since FAAD-H has been recommended for termination due to technical and cost problems.

*Development test and evaluation.*—This program element supports a variety of test and evaluation management and field activities. The Committee maintains the program near the fiscal year 1990 funding level with a recommendation of $95,842,000, a reduction of $23,768,000 to the budget request. The recommendation eliminates the following lower priority new start projects: (*a*) $13,200,000 for joint air defense operations; (*b*) $4,256,000 for camouflage/concealment/deception; and (*c*) $4,980,000 for multispectral target signatures. In addition, the joint test and evaluation feasibility studies project is reduced by $1,300,000. The Committee expects that the remaining funds contained in this program element will be allocated as specified to the Committee in August 1990.

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget estimate | Committee recommendation | Change from budget |
|---|---|---|---|
| DEFENSEWIDE MISSION SUPPORT | | | |
| Test instrumentation development | 185,899 | 107,959 | –77,940 |
| Foreign weapons evaluation | | | |
| Foreign comparative testing | 42,591 | 22,878 | –19,713 |
| Live fire testing | | | |
| Joint technical coordinating group for aircraft survivability | | | |
| Development test and evaluation | 119,610 | 95,842 | –23,768 |
| Sequestration reduction | | | |
| General increase | | | |
| Total, Director of Test and Evaluation, Defense | 348,100 | 226,679 | –121,421 |

## OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $12,725,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 90,800,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 15,000,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $15,000,000 for operational test and evaluation, defense, a reduction of $75,800,000 to the budget request for fiscal year 1991.

### DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

*Operational Test and Evaluation Capability Improvement Program [CIP].*—As discussed in the preceding report section, this program was designed to buy operational test capabilities for the services. The Committee recommends elimination of the $73,800,000 requested for this program, for the reasons explained previously.

*Operational test and evaluation.*—The Committee recommendation reduces growth requested for this program element, which funds general support for the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation. The activities include studies and efforts to evaluate and coordinate the operational testing programs among the individual services. The recommendation of $15,000,000 is $2,000,000 below the budget request.

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget estimate | Committee recommendation | Change from budget |
|---|---|---|---|
| OT&E capability improvement | 73,800 | | −73,800 |
| Operational test and evaluation | 17,000 | 15,000 | −2,000 |
| Total, Director of Operational Test and Evaluation | 90,800 | 15,000 | −75,800 |

# TITLE V

# REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $344,700,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 2,228,200,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 3,939,200,000 |

The Committee recommends appropriations totaling $3,939,200,000 in title V, revolving and management funds, for fiscal year 1991. This is $1,711,000,000 above the budget estimate.

The Department requested appropriations in this title for defense stock and industrial funds. These funds are used to manage defense support activities which are similar to commercial activities, such as the supply system and depot maintenance.

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

### STOCK FUNDS

A stock fund is a revolving fund that procures items for vendors and holds the material in inventory for sale to authorized customers. Stock fund customers, using appropriated funds, purchase this material. New initiatives which have significantly increased the Department's request for stock fund appropriations are addressed below.

*New initiatives.*—Prior to fiscal year 1991, stock funds were used to manage all consumable items and Navy repairables. Beginning with fiscal year 1991, the stock funds will also include repairable material for the Army and Air Force. In addition, the Department has included the cost of operating the supply system in the stock funds for the first time in fiscal year 1991. Previously these costs were funded directly in the Operation and maintenance appropriations. These two changes significantly affect the costs charged to stock fund customers. Due to implementation schedules, it is necessary to appropriate a portion of the costs of these two initiatives in the stock funds. The Committee recommends fully funding the Department's request of $1,190,400,000 for these efforts.

*War reserve material.*—Consistent with the Senate-passed authorization, the Committee recommends no funds for procurement of war reserve material instead of the $564,700,000 requested by the Department of Defense. In a time of reducing forces and declining major power tensions, war reserve stocks should be declining rather than increasing.

*Fuel.*—The Committee recommends an additional $2,355,000,000 for the increased cost of fuel realized during fiscal year 1990. Fuel costs through the end of the year were $16 a barrel higher than projected for the fiscal year 1991 budget, causing a significant shortfall in funding for training and other regular operations of U.S. forces which are not involved in Operation Desert Shield. The

Committee recommends funding this additional cost in the fiscal year 1991 budget as it is not directly related to Operation Desert Shield.

*Lapsed Air Force O&M repayment.*—The Air Force requested $79,300,000 as directed by Congress for repayment of charges which were incorrectly lodged against expired appropriations. With the change in procedures for dealing with expiring appropriations passed by the Senate, these funds are no longer required.

Recommended appropriations for each of the stock funds are as follows:

### ARMY STOCK FUND

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | $407,000,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 302,500,000 |

The Committee recommends $302,500,000 to fully support the stock fund initiatives to be implemented with the fiscal year 1991 budget, and no funding for war reserve material. This is $104,500,000 below the budget estimate.

### NAVY STOCK FUND

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $40,500,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 37,200,000 |
| Committee recommendation | |

The Committee recommends no appropriation of funds for the Navy stock fund which were requested only for war reserve material requirements. This is $37,200,000 below the budget estimate.

### AIR FORCE STOCK FUND

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $126,100,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 1,340,200,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 887,900,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $887,900,000 for the fiscal year 1991 stock fund initiatives, and no funds for war reserve material or repayment of Air Force expired appropriations. This is $452,300,000 below the budget estimate.

### DEFENSE STOCK FUND

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $78,100,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 50,000,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 2,355,000,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,355,000,000 for increased fuel costs and no funding for war reserve material. This is $2,305,000,000 above the budget estimate.

## INDUSTRIAL FUNDS

Industrial funds have been established for activities in which there is a large value added by the Defense establishment, such as transportation services, depot maintenance, and communications. Although it is intended that these activities operate on a breakeven basis, events during any one fiscal year may cause the funds to operate at a profit or loss. When the funds have operated at a profit, the Committee has directed that excess be returned to the operating accounts through permissive or directed transfers. Previously the Department included requests for replenishment of industrial fund operating losses in the operation and maintenance appropriations, to be passed through to the affected accounts during budget execution.

For fiscal year 1991 the Department has included funding for replenishment of prior year losses in this title, as directed by Congress during review of the fiscal year 1990 budget. These losses have resulted primarily from errors in establishing rates to be charged to customers during execution of the fiscal year 1990 budget. The Department maintains stable rates for the entire fiscal year in order to protect appropriated fund customers from cost uncertainties.

Recommended appropriations for each of the industrial funds are as follows:

### ARMY INDUSTRIAL FUND

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | $151,100,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 151,100,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $151,100,100 as requested for replenishment of the Army industrial fund.

### NAVY INDUSTRIAL FUND

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | $238,700,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 238,700,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $238,700,000 as requested for replenishment of the Navy industrial fund.

### DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL FUND

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | $4,000,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 4,000,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $4,000,000 as requested for replenishment of the Defense industrial fund.

# TITLE VI

## OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

### CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEFENSE

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $254,221,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 354,400,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 365,700,000 |

The Chemical Demilitarization Program is based on section 1412 of the 1986 Defense Authorization Act (Public Law 99-145) that directs the Department of Defense to destroy the complete unitary chemical stockpile by 1994 in conjunction with the production of binary chemical weapons. The Fiscal Year 1989 Defense Authorization Act extended program completion to 1997.

The Chemical Demilitarization Program provides resources to develop and test monitoring and disposal technology; equip, operate, and maintain disposal facilities; provide transportation of chemical agents and munitions for disposal; disposal of all chemical agent destruction waste products; and the decontamination and dismantle of all disposal equipment at the conclusion of toxic operations.

The following table details the Committee recommendation in comparison to the budget request:

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Fiscal year 1991— | | Senate compared to budget request |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Budget request | Committee recommendation | |
| Operations and maintenance | 142,800 | 175,300 | +32,500 |
| Procurement | 211,600 | 184,900 | −26,700 |
| Research and development | | 5,300 | +5,300 |
| Total | 354,400 | 365,700 | 11,300 |

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

#### BUDGET ACTIVITY 1—RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

*Cryofracture.*—The Department of Defense did not request any funding in fiscal year 1991 for the continued development of cryofracture technology. The Committee recommends the addition of $5,300,000 to the research and development activity for cryofracture process design, testing, and program oversight.

The Department of Defense has informed the Committee of additional delays and cost increases in the baseline chemical destruction system currently in development and testing. While the Committee remains supportive of the Department's efforts to date, it is concerned with these delays and cost overruns. The Committee remains convinced that the development of cryofracture as an alternative technology will give the Department and Congress a competitive alternative if the baseline system proves to be either too costly or technologically flawed.

### BUDGET ACTIVITY 2—PROCUREMENT

*Disposal facility equipment.*—The Department of Defense budget includes equipment procurement requests for the future Anniston ($59,000,000), Umatilla ($10,200,000), and Pine Bluff ($11,300,000) disposal facilities.

The Committee believes that delays in the operational verification test [OVT] at the Johnston Atoll chemical destruction system [JCADS] necessitate the need to delay the procurement of some of the equipment for future disposal facilities.

One of the major objectives of the Johnston Atoll OVT is to verify the design of the destruction facility and equipment and to provide lessons learned for future construction and procurement. Since the President sent Congress the fiscal year 1991 budget, the Committee has been informed that the completion of the JACADS operational verification test has been delayed at least 6 months. In light of these delays, the Committee does not think it is advisable to rush the procurement of facilities and equipment for Anniston, Umatilla, and Pine Bluff prior to the substantial completion of the Johnston Atoll OVT, which is now scheduled in fiscal year 1992.

The Committee recommends the reduction of $19,800,000 from the request for equipment procurement for the Anniston Disposal Facility, $3,500,000 for Umatilla, and $3,400,000 for Pine Bluff.

### BUDGET ACTIVITY 3—OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

*Johnston Atoll chemical destruction system.*—The Department has requested $55,600,000 for the operation of the Johnston Atoll chemical destruction system [JACADS] in fiscal year 1991. The Committee recommends $66,400,000 in fiscal year 1991, an increase of $10,800,000.

The program manager of JACADS has informed the Committee that additional funding over the amounts budgeted are required for increased personnel requirements to operate the plant, additional location pay differentials, and off-island rotation benefits necessary to attract and retain qualified personnel. Additional funding is also needed for supplies, materials, spare parts, protective clothing, and waste disposal. The current budget request will cover operations at JACADS only through July 1991.

*Emergency Response Program.*—The Department of Defense has requested $11,400,000 for the implementation of the Emergency Response Program in fiscal year 1991. The Committee recommends $20,000,000 in fiscal year 1991 funding, an increase of $8,600,000.

Funding requirements for the Emergency Response Program have been revised by the Department based upon a detailed and comprehensive study of the entire program. As a result of changes to the program, the fiscal year 1991 request does not fully fund the requirements to resource contractors who assist the Army, Federal

Emergency Management Agency [FEMA], and the affected States in their development of emergency response plans and requirements. Further, the budget request does not fully fund FEMA headquarters or regional offices in their execution of the program which involves training and emergency preparedness exercises. Finally the current budget request does not fund necessary State engineering studies, equipment, and participation in exercises.

*German Retrograde Program.*—The budget request includes $2,100,000 for the fiscal year 1991 funding requirements for the chemical weapons retrograde program. The Committee recommends $15,200,000 in fiscal year 1991, an increase of $13,100,000.

The Army has informed the Committee that as a result of funding uncertainty and more restrictive safety and environmental regulations, program costs have increased since the submission of the fiscal year 1991 budget. The cost to refurbish the military vans, the cost of the secondary steel containers, and the cost estimates of the transportation to Johnston Island and return the vessels to their home port have all increased since the original estimates were compiled for the budget submission. These are must pay items since the retrograde program is ongoing and will be completed by the end of the first quarter of fiscal year 1991. The Committee supports the retrograde effort and believes that the necessary funding should be appropriated to ensure safe and timely completion of this effort.

*Government Personnel Off-Island Program.*—The Committee recommends the appropriation of $2,000,000 in fiscal 1991 for the development and implementation of an off-island leave program for active duty and Federal Government workers who are assigned to Johnston Island for at least a 12-months tour.

Currently, contractor personnel assigned to Johnston Island are provided transportation to any point in the continental United States and 2 weeks paid leave every 3 months they are on the island. The JACADS program manager has informed the Committee that this will most likely be changed in the next round of negotiations to leave every 2 months for contract personnel. In comparison, active duty military personnel and Federal Government workers are provided no such benefit for the time they are on the island. The Committee notes that some of the most dangerous and physically demanding work is being done by the active duty soldiers under less than optimal conditions. The Committee believes these soldier and Federal workers deserves recognition and appreciation for they hard work and personal sacrifice.

The Committee direct that the program manager, in cooperation with the Commander of Johnston Island, develop an off-island leave program for all active duty and Federal worker who are assigned to Johnston Island for at least a 1-year tour.

## GENERAL PROVISION

*Feasibility studies.*—The Committee holds that sufficient studies, time, and resources have been expended by the Department of Defense to examine the feasibility of safely removing and transporting chemical weapons currently stored in Conus sites to other locations for eventual demilitarization and destruction. A general provision (Sec. 8079) has been included which prohibits the expenditure of any funds in fiscal year 1991 by the Department of Defense on any further studies.

In 1986 the Department of Defense began a national study effort involving eight States to develop environmental documentation for the U.S. Chemical Stockpile Disposal Program. A notice of intent to develop a programmatic environmental impact statement [PEIS] was first published in the Federal Register in January 1986.

The PEIS process established the U.S. Army as the lead agency, and identified the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA], Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA], and the Department of Health and Human Services [HHS] as cooperating agencies.

A draft programmatic environmental impact statement, developed under contract by Oak Ridge National Laboratory, was first released for comment in July 1986. Public hearings were held at the eight chemical weapons storage sites and one field congressional hearing was held in Richmond, KY. As a result of public comments, 13 support studies were requested and completed by the U.S. Army and Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

The final programmatic environmental impact statement was published on January 8, 1988, which stated in part that onsite disposal of chemical weapons was the most safe and environmentally preferred alternative. A record of decision was published on February 23, 1988, which selected the onsite incineration as the preferred alternative.

The Committee further notes that the study of onsite incineration is still active. The Department of Defense must meet all the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act [NEPA]. The Department will coordinate with the Council on Environmental Quality and has selected the Argonne National Laboratory at the University of Chicago as an independent reviewer of the process. Planning is also underway by the Department of Defense for enhancements in emergency response systems in the site specific states. The onsite environmental reviews have started and will be completed at each storage location and reviewed independently by Argonne National Laboratory. Finally, the Army will collect and analyze site-specific data to ensure that all current information was considered in the decision to destroy onsite and will certify that onsite destruction remains valid.

The Department of Defense has informed the Committee that the programmatic EIS cost $3,000,000, the 12 support studies cost $4,000,000, and estimates the approximate cost of the eight site specific studies to be $5,600,000.

## DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTERDRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $438,800,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 1,207,900,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 1,207,900,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,207,900,000 for the "Drug interdiction and counterdrug activities, defense" account, an increase of $769,100,000 above fiscal year 1990.

Recommendations by type of funding are displayed in the following table:

## DRUG INTERDICTION FUNDING

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Fiscal year 1991— | | Senate compared to budget request |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Budget request | Committee recommendation | |
| Guard and Reserve personnel | 65,500 | 105,500 | +40,000 |
| Operation and maintenance | 539,800 | 611,900 | +72,100 |
| Procurement | 553,500 | 443,700 | −109,800 |
| Research, development, test and evaluation | 20,300 | 46,800 | +28,800 |
| Military construction | 28,800 | | −28,800 |
| Total | 1,207,900 | 1,207,900 | |

*Budget justification material.*—The Committee is pleased that the Department of Defense has budgeted for drug interdiction programs in a centralized appropriation account. Unfortunately, the Department of Defense provided little backup justification material to support its request.

For fiscal year 1992, the Committee directs that the Department of Defense provide more detailed budget material that explains exactly how the Department intends to spend these resources. Procurement, research, development, test and evaluation, military personnel, and operation and maintenance funding in support of the Department's drug interdiction mission should have no less backup material than such programs in support of other departmental missions. In addition, for all counternarcotic program acquisition requests, the Committee directs that the Department of Defense counternarcotics budget justification shall include details on (1) how they relate to the Department of Defense's antidrug mission, and (2) the impact each counternarcotic request will have on providing support for Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies.

*Reprogrammings.*—The Committee has included bill language to facilitate the transfer of drug interdiction funds between drug interdiction and counterdrug activites, defense and various operation and maintenance, procurement, and research, development, test and evaluation accounts. This flexibility is accorded to the Department of Defense with the understanding that any change to the specific appropriation account allocations shown in the following drug interdiction operation and maintenance, procurement and RDT&E tables shall be subject to prior approval reprogrammings (DD 1415).

### PERSONNEL

*National Guard and Reserve personnel.*—The Committee recommends $105,500,000 for National Guard and Reserve component personnel involved in drug interdiction. This represents an increase of $40,000,000 compared with the budget request.

### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

*Support to other Federal agencies and law enforcement agencies.*—The Committee recommends $60,000,000 to support other

Federal agencies and local law enforcement with the war on drugs. The budget does not request funding for this support.

Of this amount, the Department of Defense shall make available at least $27,000,000 for operation and maintenance of Customs Service drug interdiction aerostat radars. The Committee notes that both the House and Senate Fiscal Year 1991 Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriation Acts assume transfer of the funding responsibility for operation and maintenance of the land-based aerostat radar program to the Department of Defense beginning in fiscal year 1991. This action was taken in recognition of the Department of Defense's lead agency role in detection and monitoring as provided in Public Law 101-189.

The Committee believes that the aerostat program is a critical asset in the national drug surveillance and monitoring mission of the Department of Defense as well as the U.S. Coast Guard and other law enforcement agencies. The Committee also believes that the aerostat program is the most cost-effective drug surveillance tool and should be continued in addition to any other surveillance or detection initiatives contemplated by the Department of Defense and the administration. Accordingly, bill language, section 8097, is included to ensure continued operation of these platforms.

*JTF-6.*—To enhance the coordination of counternarcotics operatins, the Committee directs the Department of Defense to expend whatever funds are necessary under section 1102 (designated for additional support for counterdrug activities) to colocate Operation Alliance with its military counterpart, JTF-6, at Fort Bliss in El Paso, TX.

*Civil Air Patrol.*—The Committee recommends not less than $1,000,000 be used for support of the Civil Air Patrol's [CAP] drug interdiction mission. The budget proposes to terminate drug interdiction funding for the CAP.

The Committee directs that the funds provided to the CAP for drug interdiction also be used for activities performed for State, local, and Federal agencies, training costs associated with the performance of drug interdiction and surveillance missions, CAP administrative costs, travel and allowances (per diem), expenses of CAP members and staff in support of these missions. Further, the Committee directs that reimbursement shall not be required from Federal, State, and local agencies that utilize the CAP for drug interdiction and surveillance.

*Other operation and maintenance funding realignments.*—The Committee assumes that the Navy will finance $18,000,000 needed for PHM patrol hydrofoil missile vessels operations from the $263,800,000 appropriated for Navy drug interdiction operation and maintenance.

The Committee assumes that the Air Force will use $16,100,000 of the $88,500,000 provided for Air Force drug interdiction operation and maintenance for CINC initiative counternarcotic efforts.

Recommended operation and maintenance funding for drug interdiction is as follows:

## DRUG INTERDICTION, O&M FUNDING

[In thousands of dollars]

| Service | Budget request | Committee recommendation |
|---|---|---|
| Army | 118,700 | 118,700 |
| Navy | 255,900 | 263,800 |
| Marine Corps | 3,200 | 3,200 |
| Air Force | 88,500 | 88,500 |
| Defense agencies | 47,400 | 47,400 |
| Army Reserve | 3,800 | 3,800 |
| Navy Reserve | 1,500 | 1,500 |
| Army Guard | 16,100 | 19,300 |
| Air Guard | 4,700 | 4,700 |
| Civil Air Patrol | | 1,000 |
| Support to other agencies | | 60,000 |
| Total | 539,800 | 611,900 |

### PROCUREMENT

*Guard drug interdiction equipment.*—Because of its special legal authorities, the National Guard has become the Department of Defense's frontline force in the war on drugs. The Department's budget, however, proposes $548,500,000 in drug interdiction equipment to support the Active components and only $5,000,000 to support the National Guard. This imbalance in procurement funding makes little sense. If the Guard is to continue its leadership role in drug interdiction, it needs the tools to do the job.

Accordingly, the Committee recommends $90,000,000 for procurement of National Guard drug interdiction equipment. Of this amount, $35,000,000 is for procurement of night vision devices and $55,000,000 is for miscellaneous drug interdiction equipment.

*Other-the-horizon-backscatter [OTH–B] radar.*—Consistent with the Senate-passed Defense authorization, the Committee recommends no funding for the OTH–B radar. This represents a reduction of $242,800,000 from the budget request.

*Other adjustments.*—During the course of fiscal year 1990 budget execution, the Committee reviewed and partially approved Defense reprogramming number FY 90–22PA, which transferred funds to various accounts to fund drug interdiction activities within the Department of Defense. The reprogramming was not fully approved by the Committee because many of the items the Department wanted to finance were clearly fiscal year 1991 activities. The Committee denied all those funds requested that were not needed until fiscal year 1991, stating that the Committee would reconsider these items within the fiscal year 1991 appropriations bill.

The Committee has reviewed the Department's fiscal year 1991 program and recommends that fiscal year 1991 requirements for the Southern Command's automated data processing enhancement ($13,200,000) and command, control, and communication upgrade ($1,100,000) be fully funded. The Committee also recommends the appropriation of $3,300,000 for spare parts for the Caribbean Basin radar network and $5,000,000 for the procurement of unmanned aerial vehicles [UAV] for drug applications with the understanding that this UAV funding and program remains under the control of the Joint Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Program Office. Finally, the Committee recommends that $1,000,000 be made available for the Pointer Short-Range Air Vehicle Program for further development of drug interdiction applications in conjunction with the Drug Enforcement Agency. These applications may include such items as color video camera, data links, and air vehicle control and recovery improvements. Again, the Committee directs that these funds are made available only for the Joint Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Program Office.

Recommended procurement funding for drug interdiction is as follows:

DRUG INTERDICTION, PROCUREMENT FUNDING

[In thousands of dollars]

| Service | Budget request | Committee recommendation |
|---|---|---|
| Army | 74,300 | 87,500 |
| Navy | 2,500 | 2,500 |
| Air Force | 326,500 | 112,500 |
| Defense agencies | 145,200 | 151,200 |
| National Guard | 5,000 | 90,000 |
| Total | 553,500 | 443,700 |

## RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

*DARPA research.*—The Committee recommends an increase of $6,500,000 in drug interdiction/research, development, test and evaluation, Defense agencies for enhanced drug interdiction research and development conducted by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency [DARPA]. These funds are provided here in lieu of an equal amount originally included for such work in DARPA's tactical technology program element (Naval warfare/special operations subproject).

*Contraband detection technology.*—The Committee recommends an increase of $20,000,000 in drug interdiction/research, development, test and evaluation, Defense agencies to be managed by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Command, Communications and Intelligence to support the development and transfer of technology to detect the flow of contraband and illegal narcotics smuggled via cargo and other means through ports of entry. The Department of Defense should focus on technology that is readily available from Government agencies, industry, and academia. It is imperative that this work be in close coordination with the U.S. Customs Service and the Southwest border trade community. Test beds should be established at selected ports of entry to identify the most promising and viable detection systems.

## DRUG INTERDICTION, RDT&E FUNDING

[In thousands of dollars]

| Service | Budget request | Committee recommendation |
|---|---|---|
| Army | 3,300 | 3,300 |
| Air Force | 2,600 | 2,600 |
| Defense agencies | 14,400 | 40,900 |
| Total | 20,300 | 46,800 |

## INSPECTOR GENERAL

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $96,800,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 98,519,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 98,519,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $98,519,000, the same as the budget request. In accordance with the fiscal year 1990 appropriations act, the Committee recommends that funds for the inspector general be included in title VII rather than title II.

# TITLE VII

## RELATED AGENCIES

### PAYMENT TO THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM FUND

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $154,900,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 164,600,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 164,600,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $164,600,000 for the payment to the Central Intelligence Agency retirement and disability system fund. The Committee recommendation concurs in the budget estimate. It is an increase of $9,700,000 over the fiscal year 1990 appropriation.

Central Intelligence Agency Retirement Act of 1964 for Certain Employees (Public Law 88-643, October 3, 1964) authorized the establishment of a Central Intelligence Agency retirement and disability system for a limited number of Agency employees and authorized the establishment and maintenance of a fund from which benefits would be paid to qualified beneficiaries. The fund finances the cost of: (1) interest on the unfunded liability, (2) annuities attributable to credit allowed for military services, (3) benefits not met by employee/employer contributions, and (4) the increase in unfunded liability resulting from liberalized benefits and Federal pay raises.

The benefits structure of this fund is similar to that of the civil service retirement system.

### INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY STAFF

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriations, 1990 | $28,032,000 |
| Budget estimate, 1991 | 28,900,000 |
| Committee recommendation | 28,900,000 |

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $28,900,000 which is the same as the budget estimate. Details of this recommendation are contained in the classified annex to this report.

## COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7, RULE XVI, OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Paragraph 7 of rule XVI requires that Committee reports on general appropriations bills identify each Committee amendment to the House bill "which proposes an item of appropriation which is not made to carry out the provisions of an existing law, a treaty stipulation, or an act or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session."

This report accompanies a bill which has its origin in the Senate. Therefore, the Committee does not believe that rule XVI, paragraph 7 applies in this case.

However, in order to present the Senate with a clear understanding of the recommendations contained herein, it is the Committee's view that the items of appropriation recommended in this bill are within amounts authorized by the Senate.

## COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 12, RULE XXVI OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Paragraph 12 of rule XXVI requires that Committee reports on a bill or joint resolution repealing or amending any statute or part of any statute include "(a) the text of the statute or part thereof which is proposed to be repealed; and (b) a comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by stricken-through type and italics, parallel columns, or other appropriate typographical devices the omissions and insertions which would be made by the bill or joint resolution if enacted in the form recommended by the committee."

With respect to this bill, in accordance with the rules of the Senate, it is the opinion of the Committee that it is necessary to dispense with these requirements in order to expedite the business of the Senate.

# TITLE VIII

## GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Committee recommends the following general provisions:

SEC. 8001. *Publicity/propaganda limitation.*—Restricts funding for publicity or propaganda to those purposes approved by Congress.

SEC. 8002. *Compensation/employment of foreign nationals.*—Allows the Department of Defense to employ foreign nationals but limits pay raises for foreign nationals funded in this act to that approved by the U.S. Government for U.S. employees or by the host nation for employees of the host nation government, whichever is higher. An exception is made for foreign national employees of the Department of Defense in the Republic of the Philippines and foreign national employees of the Department of Defense in the Republic of Turkey.

SEC. 8003. *Overseas workload program.*—Allows firms of any member nation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO], or of any major non-NATO ally, to bid on any contract for the maintenance, repair, or overhaul of equipment of the Department of Defense. For purposes of this provision, Israel is to be considered in the European theater.

SEC. 8004. *Obligation rate of appropriations.*—Limits obligation of appropriations to the current fiscal year unless expressly provided.

SEC. 8005. *Obligations in last 2 months of fiscal year.*—Prohibits obligation of more than 20 percent of appropriations in the last 2 months of the fiscal year.

SEC. 8006. *Limitation on purchases.*—Provides that the Department of Defense must purchase American-made products listed in the provision, except for purchases less than $25,000 and for purchases necessary to comply with agreements with foreign governments. Also, upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense that it is in the national interest, procurement of products from the Philippines is permitted, if the procurement is made in, or for use in, the area of responsibility of the commander in chief, Pacific (except Alaska, Hawaii, and United States possessions).

SEC. 8007. *Transfer authority.*—Allows the Department of Defense to transfer funds between appropriations and sets a limit of $1,500,000,000 on funds that may be transferred.

SEC. 8008. *Working capital funds disbursements.*—Provides the Secretary of Defense authority to transfer cash balances between revolving funds, except between stock funds and industrial funds.

SEC. 8009. *Heating plants in Europe.*—Prohibits the Department of Defense from purchasing coal or coke from foreign nations for use at DOD installations in Europe when U.S. coal is available and prohibits conversions of heating plants at U.S. bases in Europe from coal to oil or natural gas, except as provided in 10 U.S.C.

2690. The provision also addresses the conversion of heating plants in the Kaiserslautern military community [KMC] in Germany. Conversions at KMC are prohibited until 30 days after the Secretary of Defense notifies the House and Senate Appropriations Committees and until the Secretary of the Air Force has (1) ensured that the U.S. coal industry has had an opportunity to compete for third-party thermal energy supply, provided that the competitive solicitation allows proposals such as cogeneration; (2) evaluated all proposals for cost effectiveness; (3) submitted the evaluation to the General Accounting Office for review; and (4) notified the House and Senate Appropriations Committees of the evaluation results. Any conversions at KMC must be in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 2690.

SEC. 8010. *Special access program notification.*—Prohibits initiation of a special access program without 30 days prior notification to the House and Senate Appropriations and Armed Services Committees.

SEC. 8011. *Reprogramming instructions.*—Limits request for reprogramming to items of higher priority, based on unforeseen military requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and denies requests for reprogramming where item has previously been denied by Congress.

SEC. 8012. *CHAMPUS pricing.*—Provides the Secretary of Defense authority to adjust payments under CHAMPUS to physicians and other health care providers. If the adjustment is downward, it may not be more than a 15-percent reduction.

SEC. 8013. *CIA availability of funds.*—Restricts the availability of funds for programs of the Central Intelligence Agency funded in the Fiscal Year 1991 Defense Appropriations Act to the current fiscal year, except for funds appropriated for the reserve for contingencies.

SEC. 8014. *Multiyear.*—Provides the Department of Defense multiyear procurement contracting authority for a specific list of programs.

SEC. 8015. *CIA/special activities reprogramming.*—Prohibits transfer of funds between the Central Intelligence Agency and the Department of Defense for any activity different from that previously justified to Congress, unless the Director of Central Intelligence or the Secretary of Defense has notified the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

SEC. 8016. *Civilian work-years.*—Establishes a ceiling of 1,062,305 civilian work-years in the Department of Defense.

SEC. 8017. *Influencing legislative matters.*—Denies the use of funding to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before the Congress

SEC. 8018. *Wound research on dogs and cats.*—Makes permanent a provision denying use of funds to purchase dogs and cats for training students in medical treatment of wounds produced by any type of weapon. This provision has been a part of the Defense Appropriations Act since fiscal year 1984.

The Committee urges the Department of Defense to assure that the treatment of other laboratory animals for such training shall adhere to standards of the Federal animal welfare law and to those practices prevailing in the civilian medical community.

SEC. 8019. *Floating storage of petroleum.*—Requires the Department of Defense to use U.S. vessels for floating storage of petroleum.

SEC. 8020. *Humanitarian and civic assistance.*—Allows the Department of Defense to provide civic and humanitarian assistance; $15,000,000 made available to the Office of Humanitarian Assistance is addressed in the classified annex to this report.

SEC. 8021. *Retention to age 60 of Guard/Reserve technicians.*—Allows the Army and Air Force to retain National Guard and Reserve technicians until the age of 60.

SEC. 8022. *Health demonstration projects.*—Provides the Department with authority to conduct health demonstration projects.

SEC. 8023. *Educational benefits and bonuses.*—Allows the Department to make contributions for educational benefits for military members in the combat arms, members who have enlisted for at least 3 years, and allows continuation of a test program to allow benefits for noncombat arms members in a limited number of specialties.

SEC. 8024. *Tuition assistance for the Ready Reserve.*—Allows DOD to pay not more than 75 percent of charges of postsecondary education for officers in the Ready Reserve of the Army National Guard and Army Reserve.

SEC. 8025. *Organization analyses/contracting out.*—Directs that no contracting out decision affecting more than 10 DOD civilian employees can be made without analysis of the most efficient organization for the activity.

SEC. 8026. *Automated information systems/composite health care system.*—Prohibits acquisition of major automated information systems which have not completed oversight reviews required by DOD regulations. Also sets a limit of $1,600,000,000 as total life cycle cost for the composite health care system [CHCS] and prohibits further deployment of CHCS until full operational test and evaluation has been completed at all six CHCS test sites.

SEC. 8027. *CIA reserve for contingencies.*—Prohibits payment of salaries to anyone who authorizes transfer of unobligated and deobligated appropriations into CIA's reserve for contingencies.

SEC. 8028. *CIA construction projects.*—Allows funds appropriated in the Defense Appropriations Act for CIA construction projects, which are transferred to another agency for execution, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 8029. *Auxiliary minesweepers.*—Allows DOD to charter ships to be used as auxiliary minesweepers.

SEC. 8030. *CHAMPUS reform initiative limitation.*—Limits costs of CHAMPUS reform initiative to 1987 costs in California and Hawaii, but allows adjustments for price and program growth.

SEC. 8031. *Restrictions on modifications.*—Restricts the funding of modifications for equipment which is planned to be retired or otherwise disposed of within 5 years of the completion of the modification, except for safety modifications.

SEC. 8032. *Program, project, activity definition.*—Defines programs, projects, and activities for sequestration calculation under Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act.

SEC. 8033. *Fixed-price contracts.*—Prohibits the use of fixed-price type contracts for research and development programs in excess of $10,000,000.

SEC. 8034. *Motor vehicles for intelligence activities.*—Prohibits placing monetary limitations on purchase of certain vehicles for intelligence activities.

SEC. 8035. *Construction of classified military projects.*—Allows use of not more than $20,000,000 appropriated to the Army during current fiscal year to fund construction of classified military projects in the United States.

SEC. 8036. *Military technician/medical personnel reprogramming.*—Excludes civilian technicians and civilian medical personnel from sequestration.

SEC. 8037. *Interport differential.*—Disallows use of interport differential charges as an evaluation factor for award of Navy ship overhaul contracts on the west coast.

SEC. 8038. *CHAMPUS mental health benefits.*—Limits inpatient mental care to 30 days per year and inpatient care in a residential treatment center to 90 days per year. Prohibits admission of a patient by a mental health care provider to a facility in which the provider has an economic interest. Also provides for preauthorization for inpatient mental care, except in emergencies. Provisions may be waived in cases of medical or psychological necessity.

SEC. 8039. *LANDSAT/SPOT remote sensing data.*—Requires that the Defense Mapping Agency be the primary action office for purchase of LANDSAT or SPOT remote sensing data.

SEC. 8040. *Joint avionics.*—Provides that designs of the Army LH helicopter, the Navy advanced tactical aircraft, the Air Force advanced tactical fighter, and any variants of these aircraft, must incorporate joint integrated avionics working group standard avionics specifications no later than 1998.

SEC. 8041. *Pay raise absorption.*—Provides for absorption of unfunded portion of military pay raises.

SEC. 8042. *CHAMPUS reimbursement for active duty.*—Requires providers of services under CHAMPUS to provide services to active duty military at CHAMPUS rates.

SEC. 8043. *Coast Guard.*—Provides for transfer of $300,000,000 in DOD funds and in-kind support to the Coast Guard.

SEC. 8044. *Stockpile operations.*—Provides the Secretary of Defense the authority to use unobligated balances available in the national defense stockpile transaction fund to finance operational costs for the fund.

SEC. 8045. *INF treaty reimbursable expenses.*—Relates to expenses incurred by the U.S. Government on behalf of the Soviet Union in monitoring implementation of the INF Treaty. Also allows military personnel accompanying the Soviets to be paid subsistence when they are in the area of their permanent duty station.

SEC. 8046. *Consulting services.*—Reduces DOD appropriations to reflect savings resulting from decreased use of consultants. Also sets a ceiling on funds for procurement of contracted advisory or assistance services by the Department.

SEC. 8047. *Travel for families of POW/MIA.*—Allows DOD to provide transportation to families of POW's and MIA's to an annual meeting in the United States.

SEC. 8048. *B-1B electronic warfare systems.*—Requires congressional notification for use of current and expired funds to fix the B-1B bomber's deficient electronic countermeasures system and prohibits use of funds to develop and install a new radar warning receiver.

SEC. 8049. *Pease Air Force Base.*—Provides for specified indemnification for the State of New Hampshire and others specified in the provision in connection with designated environmental liabilities at Pease Air Force Base, NH. The Committee has provided this language in recognition of the unique circumstances of the situation. Pease is the first base to be closed under the Base Closure Act, and as such has not had adequate time to prepare for the potentially disruptive economic effects associated with this particular closure situation. In light of these unique circumstances at Pease, the Committee includes the indemnification provision, which in no way is intended to affect the liabilities of either the Defense Department of any indemnified party under CERCLA, or under other Federal or State statutory, regulatory, or common law. The provision simply authorizes indemnification to designated parties under specified circumstances, without affecting liability in any way.

SEC. 8050. *Economic/employment impact statements.*—Prohibits preparation of economic or employment impact analyses of an acquisition program for which all RDT&E has not been completed.

SEC. 8051. *Unsolicited proposals/consulting.*—Prohibits funding for contracts for studies, analyses, or consulting services entered into without competition on the basis of an unsolicited proposal, with certain exceptions.

SEC. 8052. *Demilitarization of firearms.*—Prohibits use of funds to demilitarize or dispose of more than 310,784 unserviceable M-1 Garand rifles and M-1 carbines.

SEC. 8053. *U.S. excess equipment.*—Makes excess U.S. defense equipment available to NATO allies which are contiguous to Iraq and to major non-NATO allies on the southern and southeastern flank of NATO which do not receive financial assistance from any country in the Near East region. The Committee expects that the Department of Defense will make every effort to provide materiel under this provision in as expeditious a manner as possible.

SEC. 8054. *Selective reenlistment bonus.*—Prohibits payment of more than 50 percent of a selective reenlistment bonus in a lump sum.

SEC. 8055. *Productivity-based incentive awards.*—Allows DOD to grant civilian employees participating in productivity-based incentive programs paid administrative leave in lieu of cash payment as compensation for productivity improvements.

SEC. 8056. *Supervisor's grade assignment.*—Denies DOD authority to base grade structure for supervisors on the number of employees supervised.

SEC. 8057. *CHAMPUS deductibles.*—Raises CHAMPUS deductibles from $50 per individual and $100 per family to $150 per individual and $300 per family. Also gives the Secretary of Defense authority to place certain restrictions on use of military hospitals (other than for emergencies) for persons who choose not to enroll in certain health care plans. Enlisted members in grades E-1 through E-4 are exempt from provisions of this section.

SEC. 8058. *Overseas civilian work-years.*—Limits the number of civilian work-years that DOD may fund overseas.

SEC. 8059. *EMPRESS.*—Prohibits use of the electromagnetic pulse radiation environment simulator for ships [EMPRESS II] in the Chesapeake Bay area without certification from the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 8060. *Local hiring in noncontiguous States.*—Requires contractors to use local residents for DOD contracts in noncontiguous States if the unemployment rate is higher than the national average.

SEC. 8061. *Alcoholic beverages.*—Requires DOD activities to procure alcoholic beverages locally in noncontiguous States.

SEC. 8062. *Ship cost adjustments.*—Directs transfers from prior-year funds for shipbuilding and conversion.

SEC. 8063. *Savings from discount air fares.*—Provides a general reduction to DOD funding to reflect savings from increased use of discount air fares by Federal employees and contractor personnel.

SEC. 8064. *Science and engineering graduate fellowships.*—Earmarks specific funds for the National Defense Science and Engineering Graduate Fellowships Program.

SEC. 8065. *Competition of depot maintenance and repair.*—Continues and enhances authorities of the Defense Department to compete acquisition of defense-related articles between defense depot maintenance activities and private firms.

SEC. 8066. *Chiropractic care demonstration project.*—Sets $4,000,000 ceiling on funds available for chiropractic care demonstration project.

SEC. 8067. *CHAMPUS peer review organization program.*—Provides for peer review of health services under CHAMPUS.

SEC. 8068. *Coordination of benefits.*—Allows military medical facilities to collect from third-party payers and increases authority to include collections from Medicare supplemental insurance policies and automobile liability and no-fault insurance.

SEC. 8069. *PCS reduction allocation.*—Directs the Secretary of Defense to allocate among the military services a $200,000,000 general reduction in funding for permanent change of station travel.

SEC. 8070. *Incentive payments under Indian Financing Act.*—Makes $8,000,000 available for incentive payments authorized under the Indian Financing Act and amends certain provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to Prescribe Penalties For Certain Acts of Violence or Intimidation, and For Other Purposes", to inform and clarify the inherent powers of Indian tribes to exercise criminal jurisdiction over all Indians.

SEC. 8071. *Brain missile wound research.*—Prohibits funding for a project involving the use of cats for brain missile wound research.

SEC. 8072. *Bone trauma research.*—Prohibits funding for a project on bone trauma research until certain conditions have been met.

SEC. 8073. *Precompetitive technology development.*—Permits Secretary of Defense to transfer up to $50,000,000 of unobligated balances in the national defense stockpile transaction fund to the Defense Agencies RDT&E account for precompetitive technology development cooperative projects between the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency and other entities.

SEC. 8074. *Wage rates for civilian health care occupations.*—Gives the Secretary of Defense the same authority to adjust wage rates for certain civilian health care providers as is authorized for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

SEC. 8075. *Energy conservation.*—Directs the Department of Defense to develop energy conservation guidelines.

SEC. 8076. *Depleted uranium stockpile.*—Directs the President to acquire not less than 36,000,000 pounds of depleted uranium, using funds available in the national defense stockpile transaction fund.

SEC. 8077. *Transportation of chemical weapons.*—Prohibits the expenditure of funds by the Department of Defense to transport any additional chemical weapons to Johnston Atoll after the completion of the European retrograde program. The general provision affirms assurances by the Secretary of Defense that Johnston Atoll would not become a repository for the destruction of all U.S. chemical weapons. Waivers have been included in this provision which will allow the transportation of chemical weapons discovered in the Pacific region and further grants the President waiver authority in time of war.

SEC. 8078. *Corporate information management initiative.*—Provides $1,000,000,000 for modernization and expansion of automated data processing systems.

SEC. 8079. *Studies of the transportation of chemical weapons.*—Prohibits funding for preparation of studies to determine the feasibility of removal and transportation of chemical weapons stored in the continental United States.

SEC. 8080. *Energy alliance fuel reserve.*—Establishes a petroleum stockpile in Israel as a wartime energy reserve for the United States. The Committee believes that such a stockpile is needed to support the operation and training of U.S. military forces outside the NATO area.

SEC. 8081. *Classified annex and report.*—This section provides that the amounts specified for the specific projects, programs or activities that are to be carried out with funds appropriated by this act and that are set forth in the classified annex are hereby incorporated as part of this act. Any limitation, requirement, or condition contained in the classified annex pertaining to any project, program or activity is hereby incorporated as a part of this act. The clear purpose and intent of this provision is to eliminate any ambiguity or uncertainty as to the binding legal effect of the amounts specified and language of the classified annex to this act, which this report accompanies.

This act appropriates funds and specifies certain limitations, requirements, and conditions on those funds for the National Foreign Intelligence Program [NFIP], related intelligence activities in other agencies, including tactical intelligence and related programs [TIARA] in DOD and special access programs in DOD. The total of all these budgets appropriated by the legislation is very substantial.

In the past, the Committee prepared a classified annex which was intended to provide binding direction on the activities of the executive branches for all these programs, as well as prescribing specific dollar amounts for them. Legally, the text of the classified annex was not incorporated into the underlying act, but the practice of the executive branch was to comply with the directives and recommendations of the annex. However, recently, and particularly in the last year, the executive branch has taken the position that the classified annex is simply a report like any other report issued by the committees of the Congress to accompany legislation enacted by the Congress, rather than law, and that such reports are merely advisory in nature. Consequently, a number of very important decisions incorporated in the classified annex to the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1990 were either ignored or challenged by both the Secretary of Defense and the Director of Central Intelligence on the grounds that they were not legally bound to comply with them. In fact, compliance with a number of the most important provisions of the classified annex was partial, came very late in the year, and only after long delays and confrontations between all three of the oversight committees and the executive branch.

The central problem in this situation is that due to the classified nature of the activities being appropriated and directed, there has simply not been any legislation that the classified annex accompanied. For reasons of national security, the funding is concealed in general DOD accounts in the underlying DOD appropriation measure, and contains no effective guidance for the departments and agencies concerned. The only vehicle available has been the classified annex itself, which the Congress intended to be binding and which the executive branch chose to regard as a standard committee report which it could comply with or ignore as it saw fit. The Committee cannot accept any further uncertainty over the binding effect of its decisions affecting such large sums of money and activities so vital and, in some cases, controversial. Thus, it believes that it has no choice but to incorporate the provisions of the classified annex into the statutory language, thereby making the annex law, and to explain its decisions in the legislation through a separate classified report accompanying the legislation. To allow the practice of the executive branch to continue would, in effect, be assenting to a de facto line-item veto authority on the part of the executive branch over the entirety of the intelligence programs and special access programs engaged in by the United States, a sweeping abdication of authority of the Congress in areas which are central and critical to the national security of the United States. The Committee can no longer accept the consequences of the executive branch's practice in this area and has taken the necessary step in the context of this legislation to remove any ambiguity as to the legally binding nature of the provisions of the classified annex.

While the classified annex cannot be debated in open session, it will be deemed to be passed concurrently and as an integral part of the unclassified Defense Appropriations Act and will be presented together with the unclassified portion of the bill to the President. They will be enacted, vetoed, or fail of enactment as one piece of legislation.

The Committee has prepared a classified report to clarify the meaning of the provisions of the bill and to provide additional guidance which the Committee expects the executive branch to regard as authoritative and to be followed in good faith as it should in respect to congressional reports accompanying all legislation.

SEC. 8082. *Civil Air Patrol.*—Makes available $5,100,000 for the Civil Air Patrol and, in addition, of funds appropriated for drug interdiction not less than $1,000,000 is to be available for Civil Air Patrol drug interdiction and surveillance activities.

SEC. 8083. *Inter-American Air Forces Academy.*—Permits the Air Force to operate the Inter-American Air Forces Academy, with certain restrictions.

SEC. 8084. *WC-130 hurricane reconnaissance aircraft.*—The Committee has included bill language directing no funds appropriated under this act be used for the transfer, deactivation, disestablishment, reduction, or conversion of the WC-130 hurricane reconnaissance aircraft, support structure or personnel from the Air Force Reserve. The Committee finds it necessary to reaffirm its strong support for the WC-130 mission in the face of repeated attempts by the Air Force, since fiscal year 1987, to discontinue the program. Last year, against the direction of the Congress, as expressed in law, the Secretary of Defense endeavored to transfer the WC-130 mission to the Department of Commerce.

It was only after repeated delays and several attempts to evade the unambiguous wishes of the Congress, that the Secretary issued a directive on July 23, 1990, ordering the transition of the WC-130 aircraft from the Active Forces to the Reserves beginning in fiscal year 1991 and concluding in fiscal year 1992. The Department of Defense should be under no illusions about the importance this Committee attaches to hurricane reconnaissance and should fully support the mission pursuant to the Committee's previous direction and statutory language. In fiscal year 1991, the Committee is providing $14,100,000 for the conduct of hurricane reconnaissance which it views as an essential mission of the Air Force and vital to the national interest.

SEC. 8085. *Allied cooperation enhancement studies.*—Provides funds for the study of potential allied cooperation in research and development and defense procurement. The Committee believes that numerous opportunities exist to strengthen strategic cooperation between the United States and Israel and expects the Department of Defense to provide concrete recommendations on how this might be accomplished across the full range of defense, aerospace, antiterrorism and counternarcotics activities. Further, the Committee believes that this cooperation will become increasingly important as threats to U.S. security interests on the periphery of Europe become more pronounced.

SEC. 8086. *U.S. beef for overseas commissaries.*—Makes available $10,000,000 of funds available in operation and maintenance accounts to transport U.S. beef to DOD commissaries in foreign countries.

SEC. 8087. *CHAMPUS shortfall funding.*—Provides an additional $1,220,000,000 to fund a projected shortfall in CHAMPUS funding in fiscal year 1991.

SEC. 8088. *Participation of workshops for the blind and handicapped.*—Grants authority for businesses providing supplies and services to the Department of Defense to credit amounts subcontracted to qualified nonprofit agencies for the blind or other severely handicapped as part of their subcontracting goal pursuant to section 8(d) of the Small Business Act.

SEC. 8089. *Kahoolawe Island Commission.*—Makes $1,500,000 available for the Kahoolawe Island Commission.

SEC. 8090. *Training at Kahoolawe Island.*—Prohibits bombing training, gunnery training, or similar munitions delivery training at Kahoolawe Island, HI.

SEC. 8091. *Legacy Resource Management Program.*—Provides funds to the Secretary of Defense for the establishment and implementation of the Legacy Resource Management Program under the existing authorities of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Environment. This program will support the inventory and management of the biological, geophysical and historical resources, including native American heritage sites, contained on 25,000,000 acres of Department of Defense land.

SEC. 8092. *Jewel bearings.*—Requires the procurement of $2,400,000 of jewel bearings from the William Langer Jewel Bearing Plant in North Dakota.

SEC. 8093. *Hamilton Air Force Base.*—Provides for cleanup of hazardous waste at Hamilton Air Force Base in accordance with existing agreement.

SEC. 8094. *Partnership with schools.*—Directs the Secretary of Defense to develop a strategy to involve civilian and military employees of the Department of Defense in partnership programs with elementary and secondary schools.

SEC. 8095. *U.S. Naval Academy.*—Prohibits obligation or expenditure of $5,000,000 appropriated to the U.S. Naval Academy until the Academy outlines steps to be taken to implement recommendations from GAO and the Academy Board of Visitors and until the Academy provides assurances that a full range of intercollegiate sports programs will be offered.

SEC. 8096. *Space-based wide area surveillance programs.*—Prohibits any Federal funds from being obligated or expended for research, development, test and evaluation for the space-based wide area surveillance project in the Air Force's space surveillance technology program element and for the Navy's program addressing the same requirements. This provision is recommended due to the lack of Defense Department adherence to the restrictions in the report language accompanying the fiscal year 1990 defense appropriations measure.

SEC. 8097. *Aerostats.*—Requires the Department of Defense to operate and maintain the Southwest border land-based aerostat drug surveillance program and provides $27,000,000 for this purpose.

SEC. 8098. *Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI).*—Specifies certain allocations and limitations on the use of funds for the SDI program.

## COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1990 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991

[Amounts in dollars]

| Item (1) | 1990 appropriation (2) | Budget estimate (3) | Committee recommendation (4) | Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or –) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 1990 appropriation (5) | Budget estimate (6) |
| TITLE I | | | | | |
| MILITARY PERSONNEL | | | | | |
| Military Personnel, Army | 24,172,813,000 | 24,295,600,000 | 23,863,803,000 | -309,010,000 | -431,797,000 |
| Military Personnel, Navy | 19,022,648,000 | 19,363,100,000 | 19,044,785,000 | +22,137,000 | -318,315,000 |
| Military Personnel, Marine Corps | 5,714,474,000 | 5,918,600,000 | 5,868,652,000 | +154,178,000 | -49,948,000 |
| Military Personnel, Air Force | 19,815,428,000 | 20,046,600,000 | 19,617,100,000 | -198,328,000 | -429,500,000 |
| Reserve Personnel, Army | 2,201,098,000 | 2,337,100,000 | 2,322,800,000 | +121,702,000 | -14,300,000 |
| Reserve Personnel, Navy | 1,572,181,000 | 1,624,600,000 | 1,608,100,000 | +35,919,000 | -16,500,000 |
| Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps | 314,452,000 | 336,400,000 | 325,500,000 | +11,048,000 | -10,900,000 |
| Reserve Personnel, Air Force | 662,837,000 | 684,000,000 | 684,110,000 | +21,273,000 | +110,000 |
| National Guard Personnel, Army | 3,246,700,000 | 3,358,700,000 | 3,331,900,000 | +85,200,000 | -26,800,000 |
| National Guard Personnel, Air Force | 1,035,732,000 | 1,089,000,000 | 1,086,950,000 | +51,218,000 | -2,050,000 |
| Total, title I, Military Personnel: New budget (obligational) authority | 77,758,363,000 | 79,053,700,000 | 77,753,700,000 | -4,663,000 | -1,300,000,000 |
| TITLE II | | | | | |
| OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE | | | | | |
| Operation and Maintenance, Army | 22,787,559,000 | 23,562,900,000 | 21,664,190,000 | -1,123,369,000 | -1,898,710,000 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Navy | 23,902,621,000 | 24,531,600,000 | 23,230,691,000 | -671,930,000 | -1,300,909,000 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps | 1,657,719,000 | 1,948,100,000 | 1,880,100,000 | +222,381,000 | -68,000,000 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Air Force | 21,806,213,000 | 22,048,900,000 | 20,064,092,000 | -1,742,121,000 | -1,984,808,000 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Defense Agencies | 7,800,156,000 | 8,663,100,000 | 8,148,163,000 | +348,007,000 | -514,937,000 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve | 849,423,000 | 890,400,000 | 871,360,000 | +21,937,000 | -19,040,000 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve | 894,800,000 | 985,924,000 | 976,114,000 | +81,314,000 | -9,810,000 |

## COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1990 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

| Item<br>(1) | 1990 appropriation<br>(2) | Budget estimate<br>(3) | Committee recommendation<br>(4) | Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or –) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 1990 appropriation<br>(5) | Budget estimate<br>(6) |
| Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve....... | 77,400,000 | 86,100,000 | 83,180,000 | +5,780,000 | -2,920,000 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve.......... | 978,500,000 | 1,042,500,000 | 1,055,360,000 | +76,860,000 | +12,860,000 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard........ | 1,839,063,000 | 1,988,500,000 | 1,960,360,000 | +121,297,000 | -28,140,000 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard......... | 1,981,900,000 | 2,175,400,000 | 2,217,990,000 | +236,090,000 | +42,590,000 |
| National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, Army........ | 4,633,000 | 5,600,000 | 5,600,000 | +967,000 | --- |
| Court of Military Appeals, Defense.................. | 3,945,000 | 5,600,000 | 5,500,000 | +1,555,000 | -100,000 |
| Environmental Restoration, Defense.................. | 601,100,000 | 817,000,000 | 1,062,527,000 | +461,427,000 | +245,527,000 |
| Goodwill Games.................. | 14,522,000 | --- | --- | -14,522,000 | --- |
| Humanitarian Assistance.................. | 12,845,000 | 13,000,000 | 13,000,000 | +155,000 | --- |
| Total, title II, Operation and Maintenance: New budget (obligational) authority........... | 85,212,399,000 | 88,764,624,000 | 83,238,227,000 | -1,974,172,000 | -5,526,397,000 |
| TITLE III | | | | | |
| PROCUREMENT | | | | | |
| Aircraft Procurement, Army.................. | 3,745,138,000 | 1,583,200,000 | 853,366,000 | -2,891,772,000 | -729,834,000 |
| Missile Procurement, Army.................. | 2,708,399,000 | 2,623,500,000 | 2,103,231,000 | -605,168,000 | -520,269,000 |
| Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army.................. | 2,707,611,000 | 1,312,300,000 | 1,895,552,000 | -812,059,000 | +583,252,000 |
| (By transfer).................. | --- | (860,300,000) | --- | --- | (-860,300,000) |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Army.................. | 2,011,243,000 | 1,424,400,000 | 1,040,459,000 | -970,784,000 | -383,941,000 |
| Other Procurement, Army.................. | 3,669,219,000 | 2,827,500,000 | 2,117,812,000 | -1,551,407,000 | -709,688,000 |
| Aircraft Procurement, Navy.................. | 9,389,266,000 | 9,838,600,000 | 7,343,737,000 | -2,045,529,000 | -2,494,863,000 |
| Weapons Procurement, Navy.................. | 5,392,312,000 | 6,161,400,000 | 5,892,242,000 | +499,930,000 | -269,158,000 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy | 11,409,066,000 | 11,195,200,000 | 9,313,672,000 | -2,095,394,000 | -1,881,528,000 |
| (By transfer) | (100,000,000) | --- | --- | (-100,000,000) | --- |
| Other Procurement, Navy | 7,895,461,000 | 6,081,500,000 | 5,811,675,000 | -2,083,786,000 | -269,825,000 |
| Procurement, Marine Corps | 1,213,792,000 | 782,100,000 | 667,539,000 | -546,253,000 | -114,561,000 |
| Aircraft Procurement, Air Force | 15,679,242,000 | 13,718,650,000 | 10,277,853,000 | -5,401,389,000 | -3,440,797,000 |
| (By transfer) | --- | (498,750,000) | --- | --- | (-498,750,000) |
| Missile Procurement, Air Force | 6,916,863,000 | 9,005,700,000 | 6,243,922,000 | -672,941,000 | -2,761,778,000 |
| Other Procurement, Air Force | 8,396,853,000 | 8,307,400,000 | 7,485,442,000 | -911,411,000 | -821,958,000 |
| National Guard and Reserve Equipment | 973,720,000 | 455,400,000 | 2,499,469,000 | +1,525,749,000 | +2,044,069,000 |
| Procurement, Defense Agencies | 1,281,913,000 | 1,969,400,000 | 1,913,846,000 | +631,933,000 | -55,554,000 |
| Defense Production Act Purchases | 49,479,000 | 1,800,000 | 30,000,000 | -19,479,000 | +28,200,000 |
| Total, title III, Procurement: | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority | 83,439,577,000 | 77,288,050,000 | 65,489,817,000 | -17,949,760,000 | -11,798,233,000 |
| (By transfer) | (100,000,000) | (1,359,050,000) | --- | (-100,000,000) | (-1,359,050,000) |

## TITLE IV

## RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army | 5,354,508,000 | 6,025,900,000 | 5,299,793,000 | -54,715,000 | -726,107,000 |
| Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy 1/ | 9,739,174,000 | 9,102,400,000 | 8,459,853,000 | -1,279,321,000 | -642,547,000 |
| Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force | 13,635,570,000 | 13,276,300,000 | 11,575,574,000 | -2,059,996,000 | -1,700,726,000 |
| Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense Agencies | 8,113,049,000 | 9,249,300,000 | 8,563,407,000 | +450,358,000 | -685,893,000 |
| Developmental Test and Evaluation, Defense | 178,221,000 | 348,100,000 | 226,679,000 | +48,458,000 | -121,421,000 |
| Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense | 12,725,000 | 90,800,000 | 15,000,000 | +2,275,000 | -75,800,000 |
| Total, title IV, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation: | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority | 37,033,247,000 | 38,092,800,000 | 34,140,306,000 | -2,892,941,000 | -3,952,494,000 |

## TITLE V

## REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army Stock Fund | --- | 407,000,000 | 302,500,000 | +302,500,000 | -104,500,000 |
| Navy Stock Fund | 40,500,000 | 37,200,000 | --- | -40,500,000 | -37,200,000 |
| Marine Corps Stock Fund | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Air Force Stock Fund | 126,100,000 | 1,340,200,000 | 887,900,000 | +761,800,000 | -452,300,000 |
| Defense Stock Fund | 78,100,000 | 50,000,000 | 2,355,000,000 | +2,276,900,000 | +2,305,000,000 |
| Army industrial fund | --- | 151,100,000 | 151,100,000 | +151,100,000 | --- |
| Navy industrial fund | --- | 238,700,000 | 238,700,000 | +238,700,000 | --- |

## COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1990 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

| Item (1) | 1990 appropriation (2) | Budget estimate (3) | Committee recommendation (4) | Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or –): 1990 appropriation (5) | Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or –): Budget estimate (6) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Defense industrial fund | --- | 4,000,000 | 4,000,000 | +4,000,000 | --- |
| Emergency Response Fund | 100,000,000 | --- | --- | -100,000,000 | --- |
| Total, title V, Revolving and Management Funds: New budget (obligational) authority | 344,700,000 | 2,228,200,000 | 3,939,200,000 | +3,594,500,000 | +1,711,000,000 |
| TITLE VI | | | | | |
| OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS | | | | | |
| Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense: 2/ | | | | | |
| Operation and maintenance | 145,611,000 | 142,800,000 | 175,500,000 | +29,889,000 | +32,700,000 |
| Research, development, test, and evaluation | 8,000,000 | --- | 5,300,000 | -2,700,000 | +5,300,000 |
| Procurement | 73,000,000 | 211,600,000 | 184,900,000 | +111,900,000 | -26,700,000 |
| Retrograde | 27,610,000 | --- | --- | -27,610,000 | --- |
| Total, Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense | 254,221,000 | 354,400,000 | 365,700,000 | +111,479,000 | +11,300,000 |
| Drug Interdiction Defense | 446,737,000 | 1,207,900,000 | 1,207,900,000 | +761,163,000 | --- |
| Office of the Inspector General | 96,800,000 | 99,500,000 | 99,500,000 | +2,700,000 | --- |
| Total, title VI, Other Department of Defense Appropriations: New budget (obligational) authority | 797,758,000 | 1,661,800,000 | 1,673,100,000 | +875,342,000 | +11,300,000 |

## TITLE VII

## RELATED AGENCIES

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fund | 154,900,000 | 164,600,000 | 164,600,000 | +9,700,000 | --- |
| Intelligence Community Staff | 28,032,000 | 28,900,000 | 28,900,000 | +868,000 | --- |
| The Mildred and Claude Pepper Foundation | 10,000,000 | --- | --- | -10,000,000 | --- |
| Total, title VII, Related Agencies: New budget (obligational) authority | 192,932,000 | 193,500,000 | 193,500,000 | +568,000 | --- |

## TITLE VIII

## GENERAL PROVISIONS

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Additional transfer authority (sec. 8007) | (3,000,000,000) | (3,000,000,000) | (1,500,000,000) | (-1,500,000,000) | (-1,500,000,000) |
| Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy (reappropriation) | 100,000,000 | --- | --- | -100,000,000 | --- |
| General reduction, contractor travel (sec. 8063) | -37,000,000 | --- | -27,000,000 | +10,000,000 | -27,000,000 |
| Consultant Services (sec. 8046) | -125,000,000 | --- | -180,000,000 | -55,000,000 | -180,000,000 |
| Reduction in personnel | -138,000,000 | --- | --- | +138,000,000 | --- |
| PCS Reduction (sec. 8069) | --- | --- | -200,000,000 | -200,000,000 | -200,000,000 |
| CHAMPUS (sec. 8087) | --- | --- | 1,220,000,000 | +1,220,000,000 | +1,220,000,000 |
| Corporate Information Management (sec. 8078) | --- | --- | 1,000,000,000 | +1,000,000,000 | +1,000,000,000 |
| General reduction, missiles | -150,000,000 | --- | --- | +150,000,000 | --- |
| Total, title VIII, General Provisions: New budget (obligational) authority | -350,000,000 | --- | 1,813,000,000 | +2,163,000,000 | +1,813,000,000 |

## RECAPITULATION

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title I - Military Personnel | 77,758,363,000 | 79,053,700,000 | 77,753,700,000 | -4,663,000 | -1,300,000,000 |
| Title II - Operation and Maintenance | 85,212,399,000 | 88,764,624,000 | 83,238,227,000 | -1,974,172,000 | -5,526,397,000 |
| Title III - Procurement | 83,439,577,000 | 77,288,050,000 | 65,489,817,000 | -17,949,760,000 | -11,798,233,000 |
| (By transfer) | (100,000,000) | (1,359,050,000) | --- | (-100,000,000) | (-1,359,050,000) |
| Title IV - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation | 37,033,247,000 | 38,092,800,000 | 34,140,306,000 | -2,892,941,000 | -3,952,494,000 |
| Title V - Revolving and management funds | 344,700,000 | 2,228,200,000 | 3,939,200,000 | +3,594,500,000 | +1,711,000,000 |
| Title VI - Other Department of Defense Appropriations | 797,758,000 | 1,661,800,000 | 1,673,100,000 | +875,342,000 | +11,300,000 |
| Title VII - Related agencies | 192,932,000 | 193,500,000 | 193,500,000 | +568,000 | --- |

## COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1990 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

| Item (1) | 1990 appropriation (2) | Budget estimate (3) | Committee recom-mendation (4) | Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or –) 1990 appropriation (5) | Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or –) Budget estimate (6) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title VIII - General provisions........................ | -350,000,000 | --- | 1,813,000,000 | +2,163,000,000 | +1,813,000,000 |
| (Additional transfer authority)................... | (3,000,000,000) | (3,000,000,000) | (1,500,000,000) | (-1,500,000,000) | (-1,500,000,000) |
| Total, Department of Defense..................... | 284,428,976,000 | 287,282,674,000 | 268,240,850,000 | -16,188,126,000 | -19,041,824,000 |
| (By transfer)................................ | (100,000,000) | (1,359,050,000) | --- | (-100,000,000) | (-1,359,050,000) |
| Total funding available.......................... | 284,528,976,000 | 288,641,724,000 | 268,240,850,000 | -16,288,126,000 | -20,400,874,000 |
| (Transfer authority)......................... | (3,000,000,000) | (3,000,000,000) | (1,500,000,000) | (-1,500,000,000) | (-1,500,000,000) |

○